


GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
DEPARTMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY
CENTRAL ARCHÆOLOGICAL
LIBRARY


CALL No. 891.05 / J.A.O.S

ACC. No. 24562

D.G.A. 79.

GIPN—S4—2D. G. Arch.N. D./57—27-9-58—1,00,000





JOURNAL
OF THE
AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

EDITED BY

MAX L. MARGOLIS
Dropsie College

W. NORMAN BROWN
University of Pennsylvania

JOHN K. SHRYOCK
University of Pennsylvania

24562

VOLUME 51

891.05
J. A. O. S.

~~A330~~

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

ADDRESS, CARE OF

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT, U. S. A.

1931

§

	PAGE
GOTTHEIL, RICHARD: Achmed Taimur Pasha, Theodor Nöldeke, and Edouard Sachau: An Appreciation	104
HAMILTON, CLARENCE H.: Hsüan Chuang and the Wei Shih Philoso- phy	291
HOPKINS, CLARK: The Palmyrene Gods at Dura-Europos	119
HOPKINS, E. WASHBURN: Sanskrit <i>te</i> for <i>tvām</i>	285
——— The Divinity of Kings	309
——— Review of Kane's <i>History of Dharmaśāstra</i>	80
——— Review of Sukthankar's <i>The Mahābhārata</i>	179
——— Review of Santosh Kumar Das, <i>The Educational System of the Ancient Hindus</i>	335
HITTI, PHILIP K.: Review of 'Abdullāh al-Bustāni's <i>Al-Bustān</i>	177
——— Review of Muḥammad Kurd'ali's <i>Kitāb Khīṭaṭ al-Shām</i>	178
——— Review of Massignon's <i>Récueil de textes inédits concernant l'histoire de la mystique en pays d'Islam</i>	179
HUMMEL, ARTHUR W.: <i>Ts'ung shu</i>	40
KENT, ROLAND G.: The Recently Published Old Persian Inscriptions	189
KRAUSS, S.: Review of Beer's <i>Mishna Manuscript Codex Kaufmann A. 50</i>	78
LAUTER, BERTHOLD: Columbus and Cathay, and the Meaning of America to the Orientalist	87
MARTINOVITCH, N.: Crusius or Orosius	171
——— Review of Coomaraswamy's <i>Mughal Painting</i>	71
——— Review of Blochet's <i>Musulman Painting XIIIth-XVIIth Cen- tury</i>	71
——— Review of Dimand's <i>A Handbook of Mohammedan Decorative Arts</i>	84
MONTGOMERY, JAMES A.: Review of Bauer's and Leander's <i>Gram- matik des Biblisch-Aramäischen</i>	317
——— Review of Bauer's and Leander's <i>Kurzgefasste Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen</i>	317
——— Review of Leander's <i>Laut- und Formen-Lehre des Ägyptisch- Aramäischen</i>	317
——— Review of Rowley's <i>The Aramaic of the Old Testament</i>	317
——— Review of Charles' <i>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel</i>	317
——— Review of Schmidt's <i>Ibn Khaldun</i>	327
——— Review of Popper's <i>Abū 'l-Maḥāsīn ibn Taghrī Birdī's Annals</i>	327
——— Review of Popper's <i>Extracts from Abū 'l-Maḥāsīn ibn Taghrī Birdī's Chronicle</i>	327
——— Review of Hitti's <i>Kitāb al-'itibār li- 'Usamah ibn Munkid</i>	327
——— Review of Amin Rihani's <i>Ta'riḥ Najd</i>	328
PFEIFFER, ROBERT H.: Review of Chiera's <i>American Schools of Orien- tal Research</i>	76
PRICE, IRA M.: Light out of Ur—The Devotion of Elamite Kings to Sumerian Deities	164
PRINCE, JOHN DYNELEY: Surviving Turkish Elements in Serbo- Croatian	241

ILLUSTRATIONS

PAGE

Chinese Bronze Tsun in the University Museum, Philadelphia.	
Drawings of Mask Designs from Various Ancient Bronzes.	
Mask Design from a Hu in the Sumitomo Collection.	
Early Forms of the Character "I."	
Low Relief depicting ogre mask, or T'ao-t'ieh.	
Low Relief depicting two phoenix birds.	
Drawings of Bird Designs from Ancient Bronzes.	
Rubbing of the Inscription on the Shang Tsun in the University Museum.	
Rubbing of the Inscription of the Shang Yu in the Peking Museum.	
Micro-photograph of the surface of the unetched polished metal showing porous structure.	
Micro-photograph of a section of the etched metal.	
.	following page 22
Dancing scene showing the lute and the harp- <i>viñā</i>	opposite 50
A new inscription of Entemena	263

(2676a)

THE MEANING OF THE HINDU-JAVANESE *candi*


WILLEM STUTTERHEIM

SOERABAKARTA, JAVA

IT IS KNOWN to but few that the so-called "Hindu temples" on the isle of Java are not temples nor were they built by Hindus. The close resemblance in style between some of them and certain temples in India, together with the fact that among the buildings of the modern Javanese there are no specimens of such skilled workmanship and artistic significance as could rival in beauty and refinement the work of their ancestors, originally confirmed the theory that Hindus must have been the builders of the *candis*.¹ Several considerations, however, lead to the conclusion that the Javanese people themselves have built their monuments and that at most the Hindus were their teachers in preceding times. In spite of the close affinity of the old Javanese and the Hindu styles, there are some facts which contradict the theory that the Hindu was the source of the Javanese. The case is similar to that in Europe, where buildings of Gothic style in England and Germany were not necessarily the work of French artisans from the Île de France.

Regarding the assertion that these so-called Hindu temples are for the greater part not temples at all, it is true that, viewed from the outside and inside, they bear all the characteristics of a temple; there are statues of gods, altars, reliefs with the holy stories of Viṣṇu's *avatāras*, and other elements. Yet, closer examination has revealed that the statues are not merely representations of gods. They show several deviations from the canonical rules, which clearly indicate that they are images of deceased kings in the shape of gods. Further, we must consider the stone caskets containing various magic stones and metals mixed with human ashes and buried in a deep shaft beneath the statues. It is highly probable that these ashes were remains of the burned corpses of deceased kings and that the precious stones and metals, attributed to a certain god, served

¹ This view was held by Raffles and other explorers at the beginning of the 19th century and is still prevalent among the general public. The term "Hindu antiquities" (instead of "Javanese antiquities") is so well accepted that one can find it even on the signposts of the Archaeological Survey in the Netherlands Indies.



as magic points of attraction for the particular god in whom the king's soul was absorbed after death and of whom the king was an incarnation during his life.

Each king or other high personage was "*candi*-ed" in this way, as we can gather from several loci in old Javanese literature. The terminus technicus for this was *cinandi*, to be put in a *candi*. *Candi* therefore means a special kind of monument, wherein the ashes of the burned corpse of a king were placed; the word is derived from one of the names of the death-goddess Durgā.² The whole matter seems clear enough and is in no need of further explanation.

However, there are two questions to be answered. First, if the majority of the so-called temples are to be considered as mausolea, where are the real temples? And secondly, why did the Javanese choose exactly the Hindu temple as a model?

The first question can be answered easily. A visit to Bali, where the old tradition of temple building is still preserved, will show that the old Javanese temples were merely a series of enclosures, furnished with wooden (seldom stone) structures, each containing only one chamber and covered with an odd number of pyramidically superimposed roofs. These wooden buildings naturally disappeared in Java during the Muhammadan period and the temple walls were demolished. Only the stone *candis*, which were built within these enclosures, lasted longer, although their stone served at last with equal success for building sugarmills and railway stations.

The second question, however, puzzles us more. Why did the Javanese choose the Hindu temple as a model in building mausolea for their deceased kings?

To answer this question we first should realize what the shape of a Hindu temple means, that is to say, a Hindu temple of the type that was introduced into Java by the Hindus before 700 A. D. Elsewhere I have discussed the matter at length, and I will speak of it only briefly now.³ Study of the development of the *stūpa* in the shape appearing in the monument of Barabudur on Java discloses that its prototype was the Gandhāra *stūpa*, composed of the old Indian *stūpa* and the adapted Babylonian *ziggurat*, a combination in which is also the origin of the Chinese pagoda and the

² *Candi* may be an abbreviation of Sanskrit *candigrha*, house of Durgā. The Balinese call the temple of Durgā *pura dalēm*.

³ See *Chandi Barabudur, Name, Form and Significance*, Weltevreden (Java), Kolff & Co., 1931.

Javanese Buddhist temple. The principle is quite clear; the top of a terraced pyramid was the adequate place for such a divine object as a reliquary of the Buddha's ashes. Did not a terraced pyramid bear the grave of Cyrus, and was not its summit in still older times the place to which the gods descended from heaven? The traces of those strong influences which came from Central Asia to Gandhāra and brought a mixture of Persian, Assyrian, Greek, and other elements to the valley of the Indus and the Ganges, remove our doubts as to the probability of the combination of an Indian *stūpa* and a Babylonian *ziggurat*.

This combination, moreover, developed in three directions and took the following forms. In the commonest, the terraced pyramid is enlarged to a base for a comparatively small *stūpa*; a result of this development, for example, is the Barabudur. In the second the pyramid is raised till it becomes a tower crowned with a minute *stūpa*, as the Chinese pagoda shows. In the third formation the lowest terrace is furnished with niches, which in time grew deeper and deeper until each took on the shape of a cella. For this purpose the walls of the terrace were built increasingly higher, while the other terraces together with the *stūpa* got the appearance of a *stūpa*-crowned roof. In this way the prototype of the *caṇḍi* was born and, as every archaeologist knows, such temples are understood best when they are considered as a rock, shaped like a terraced pyramid, the base of which is heightened and the interior dug out into a cella.

It is regrettable that only a few prototypes of this *caṇḍi* exist in India. Monuments of just that period in which the Indian art was brought to Java are very rare. But with the help of old Tibetan architectural forms and through analysis of the later Indian and Indonesian temples one can get an idea of the development.

What, however, did this combination of *stūpa* and *ziggurat*, developed into a *caṇḍi*, symbolize?

The *ziggurat*, as known, is the representation of heaven and its top is supposed to have been the temporary dwelling place of the gods. The placing of the divine reliquary of the Buddha's ashes on its summit (enclosed in the *stūpa*) shows us that this conception was not wholly forgotten among the neighbors of the homeland of the *ziggurat*, even in the Gandhāran period. So, when we encounter on Bali wooden buildings shaped thus (where the terraces

are replaced by thatched roofs and the crowning *stūpa* by an up-turned glass gin-bottle) and we are informed that they are known as Meru (mountain of heaven), we may understand that this symbolical meaning is still alive and that the prototype was considered a replica of the heavenly mountain, the abode of the gods.⁴

This conception of the *caṇḍi*-form is very clearly indicated in the monuments of Prambanan on Java and especially in the *caṇḍi* Lara Jonggrang near that place. From a base decorated with trees of heaven and figures of singing celestial birds rises the body of the temple surrounded by a balustrade with celestial dancers and musicians. Guardian gods, each patronizing one of the directions of the universe, surround the realm of the higher gods, who appear in the deep niches of the temple body. Minor gods have their own shallow niches distributed over the surface, but the great Śiva Mahādeva stands in the lofty cella, hidden from the sight of people, like a king in his palace. Stylized long undulating lotus stalks and strings of jewels creep or hang over the whole temple surface imitating the supposed decorations of mount Meru.

In Eastern Java and in Bali the turtle, which in some cases bears the whole building on its back, just as Viṣṇu in the shape of a turtle in the *kūrmāvatāra* bore the mountain of heaven, and the cloud-ornament that surrounds the temple body again provide a confirmation of the same idea.

It seems now that herewith the answer to the question is given. Indeed, if the king after his death is absorbed in the god whose incarnation he was during life, the representation of this king in the shape of that very god and the placing of his image in a temple, which can be understood as a replica of the dwelling place of the gods in heaven, must be correct and evident.

There are, however, some details in the history of Javanese art that point in another direction.

In the first place I must remind the reader of the fact that in India there has never been found any statue of a deceased king in the guise of a god which was worshipped in the way described above.⁵ Only Farther India and Indonesia provided us with such specimens.

⁴ See also the study of Robert Heine-Geldern in *Wiener Beiträge zur Kunst und Kultur Asiens*, Band IV, pp. 28 ff. (Krystall Verlag, Vienna, 1930).

⁵ However, "having become a god" (or a goddess) is in Indian literature

In the second place I must point out that the history of Javanese art shows an ever increasing difference between the style of these statues and that of the representation of real gods, for instance on the reliefs. This difference is marked by the fact that the statues show more and more the features of a dead person, now and then even of a mummy. The legs are placed close together, the eyes are closed, and the whole appearance is that of a corpse in full pontificals. But the real gods, as depicted in the reliefs, are evidently living beings just like those of the shadow play, the *wayang*. There only the highest god, Bhaṭāra Guru, i. e. Śiva Mahādeva, is depicted in the above mentioned way; but this is not surprising, since he is the king of the gods and his representation might have been influenced by the old traditional manner of making a king's statue.

Some other details prove that no real god's image was intended; the attributes, held in the various hands, are not quite the same as are found in the traditional statues of gods. For instance, Viṣṇu's *śaṅkha* sometimes has a snail leaving its shell, just as the soul leaves its temporal dwelling, the body. Further indications may be seen in the puzzling objects that are found in the god's hands (when they are joined in front of his lap in the manner known in Buddhist iconography as *dhyānamudrā*). Sometimes they look like lotus-buds, sometimes like offerings made of flowers. But they always point to the fact that the statue is to be interpreted as that of a dead king.

But the most important feature of these statues is the increasing frontality in the style, which lends to them the appearance of a mummy. This at once excludes the possibility that they are por-

(e. g. *devabhuyāṁ gate narendre*, in Harṣacarita, 215) a regular periphrastic expression for "having died", just as we say "gone to heaven" in the same sense. In the *Pratimā Nāṭaka* it is explicitly stated that Bharata cannot tell whether the figures worshipped in the *devakula* are those of gods or human beings. There is also the well-known custom of erecting a lingam on the *samādhi* of a deceased saint or teacher "as though to proclaim to the world that the body buried below has attained to the sacred form of Śiva-liṅga" (*A. S. I., A. R., Southern Circle*, 1915-16, p. 34). The Gaṅga king Rājāditya caused to be built a temple to Īśvara (Śiva) on the spot where his father had been buried" (*ib.*, where also other cases of a connection between temples and burying grounds are cited). [A. K. C.]

traits of living kings or living gods. Here, in my opinion, begins the way leading to the right understanding of the *caṇḍi*.

As is well known, the Indonesian people, as far as they have changed their pre-animistic conception of life into an animistic one, attach great importance to the cult of their ancestors. Establishing contact between the soul of the deceased and his family at important occasions is the most striking feature of this cult. Sometimes it is done in a shamanistic way by receiving the soul in the body of a shaman. Sometimes pieces of the dead man's skull or the whole skull are used as a receptacle for his soul. Well known, although strictly speaking not Indonesian, are the wooden figures with a thin body and a large head, containing a skull and called *korwar*. Another form of this receptacle is that of a wooden figure without portions of the corpse, like those used by the Dayaks of Borneo and by other Indonesians.⁶

Schadee tells us that the Landak Dayaks and the Tayan Dayaks make figures of their deceased chiefs and champions.⁷ They are called *pantak* and are placed close to the roads, but are later removed and erected in a kind of graveyard (*padagei*) after one of the dead man's offspring has decapitated a foe. This yard is consecrated to the god of illness and decapitation, named *Kēmang Trio*. The *pantaks* can be divided into three kinds: one for the *pañcalang* (chiefs of villages and military chiefs), one for the *pangalango* (champions), and one for the *tuwa bidi* (a kind of augurers). The latter are represented dancing, just like the wooden figures of gods and heroes on Bali (*togog*). When the *pantak* is ready, the soul of the deceased is summoned by the priests and invited to occupy it. A ceremony is performed, the *pantak* is set upright,

⁶ For instance, the *adus* of the inhabitants of Nias (east of Sumatra) in which is kept the so-called *moko-moko*, a spider, considered to be the incarnation of the dead man's soul. On the Aru islands grains of rice are strewn over and in front of little figures of the deceased. Through this ceremony the soul is supposed to enter the figure. Among the inhabitants of the Kei islands a figure is made only of the founder of the village, not of common people. It is superfluous to enumerate all the peoples of the Archipelago that make figures of their ancestors in order to worship them. From the Philippines to Sumatra it is a widespread custom.

⁷ *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië* ('sGravenhage), 1907 (Vol. LX), p. 108, and 1910 (Vol. LXIII), p. 469 ff.

sprinkled with rice and fed like a child by putting little bits of rice in his mouth. Then the *pantak* is taken out of the house and planted in the ground in the neighbourhood of the big village building; this ceremony takes place amid a great uproar. Finally, a roof on four poles is placed above the *pantak*. This happens among the Pade Dayaks on the seventh day after death.

The Dayaks believe that at the moment the *pantak* is brought to the *padagei*, the soul of the deceased is absorbed by the above mentioned Kẽmang Trio and returns to its origin; that is to say, only the soul of a chief or a priest, as this would be an impossibility for the soul of a common man.

Also the Ulu Air Dayaks have such a ceremony, described in 1922 by Ten Cate and in 1924 by Bouman.⁸ Only they use other names; the figure is called *tẽmadu*. They also use a pole from six to seven meters in height called *pantar*. Figure and pole serve as stake for torturing the buffaloes to death at the time of the big funeral festival (*tiwah*); these poles prove that the ceremony actually took place.

Agerbeek does not mention these figures, but he, too, speaks of long *pantar* poles crowned with a bird (Pinuh).⁹

Mallinckrodt mentions so-called *pajahan* in Kualakapuas, which are perhaps the same as *pantak* and *tẽmadu*; they are flat figures cut out of boards.¹⁰ This author, however, also speaks of *sapundus*, erected on the seventh day after death for tying up the buffaloes. These *sapundus*, rather than the *pajahans*, might be the counterpart of the *pantaks*. The passage, however, is not very clear. After the erection of the *sapundus* the Ngaju Dayaks have a ceremony for conducting the souls to heaven, which is done by a shaman, who describes the adventures of his journey in a litany. This ceremony is called *magah liau*.

Before continuing my argument I wish to draw the reader's attention to the fact that the instances given above are taken from a people not influenced by the Hindus and their religion. Now we shall proceed and consider the funeral ceremonies of the Balinese, which were already hinduized in the first millennium of our era.

⁸ *Tijdschrift van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* (Batavia), 1922 (Vol. LXI), p. 201 ff., and 1924 (Vol. LXIV), p. 173 ff.

⁹ *Ibidem*, 1909 (Vol. LI), p. 446 ff.

¹⁰ *Bijdragen etc.*, 1925 (Vol. LXXXI), p. 263 ff.

We can eliminate at once the cremation ceremonies, as they are for the greater part Hinduistic in origin, although they show many traces of Indonesian beliefs. The ceremony, however, which is most important for our purpose is the so-called *mumukur* ceremony, held on an undefined day after the cremation and having the same aim as the above mentioned ceremonies of the Dayaks—the deliverance of the soul from all earthly bonds.¹¹ At this ceremony the priests make little puppets of flowers and other herbaceous materials, which serve as temporary receptacles for the souls of the burned. When the puppets are ready, the soul of the deceased is summoned by the priests and invited to enter the puppets, called *puṣpaśarīra*, “body of flowers.” Then the puppets are fed with rice. On Java, in the mountainous district of the Tenggër, where Islām is not yet accepted, the puppets, called *pitra* (from Sanskrit *pitṛ*?), are carried like helpless children in a *slenḍang*, just like the *pantaks* of the Dayaks in Borneo.¹² Still more striking is the fact that the *pitras* are brought to the *kabuyutan* after it is supposed that the souls of the ancestors, which temporarily dwelt in these puppets, have gone to heaven. The *kabuyutan* is a holy dwelling-place for the ancestors, which may be compared with the *padagei* of the Dayaks, as both are said to be the abode of the god of death and illness (Kēmang Trio of the Dayaks, Kala of the Tenggërese).

Indeed, the similarity of the treatment the animistic Dayaks accord their ancestor-figures and the Hinduistic Balinese and Tenggërese accord their *puṣpaśarīras* and *pitras* is very striking; only in the names and some other unimportant details is the great difference in religion made manifest. This is rather surprising, for the ceremonies of the Balinese all bear a pronounced Hinduistic character, while those of the Dayaks must be considered purely Indonesian, as already stated. But the matter grows more and more interesting when we consider the old Javanese way of treating the soul of a deceased king after his cremation, and compare it with the above described ceremonies.

¹¹ See Paul Wirz, *Der Totenkult auf Bali*, Stuttgart, 1928, p. 117 ff., and K. Crueq, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Balisch doodenritueel*, Santpoort, 1928, p. 82 ff.

¹² See Scholte in *Handelingen van het eerste congres voor de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Java*, Weltevreden, 1919, p. 47 ff.

Unfortunately only little is known of the old Javanese funeral ceremonies. Apart from some data taken from the monuments and inscriptions and referring to the fact that the ashes were put in a *caṇḍi*, we have only some information from the poem of Prapañca called *Nāgarakṛtāgama* and written in 1365 A. D. in honor of His Majesty the King of Majapahit, Ayam Wuruk.¹³ There we find a description of the *śrāddha* ceremony, held in 1362, for the soul of H. M. the Queen Grandmother Gāyatrī, the so-called *rājapatnī*.¹⁴ As we touch here the nucleus of the main question I will give parts of the text with translation.

Cantos 63-67 deal with the description of the ceremony but only some loci are of special importance. The poet begins by telling how the regent, Gajah Mada, is admitted to an audience with the king and how he reminds him of his duty to hold the *śrāddha* ceremony for the Queen Grandmother, who died twelve years ago. This ceremony should take place on the fourth of the month of Bhādra and the following days. A conference is held and the costs are fixed. Painters, sculptors, and goldsmiths are busy decorating the palace and preparing everything necessary for the ceremony. At the propitious moment all the inhabitants of the king's palace are gathered together. The king and the queen are seated on the side to the west, the higher officials and their wives to the north and the east, and the lower ones to the south. The text also seems to mention the presence of an image:

ngkāne madhya witāna śobhita rinēngga lwir prisadyāruhur

(in the translation of Kern), "In the midst of the open festive hall shone a high *prisadi*-image." But I am inclined to translate: "There was a *madhya*-tower, adorned, colored, high like a *prisadi*." In fact the meaning of the word *prisadi* is not quite clear,¹⁵ but that of *madhya*, translated by Kern "in the midst of," may be the same as the Balinese *madya*, an adorned pyramidal tower, serving as receptacle of the *puṣpaśarīra* (see above).¹⁶ If this is correct,

¹³ Ed. by Dr. H. Kern and Dr. N. J. Krom, 'sGravenhage, 1919.

¹⁴ Dr. F. D. K. Bosch first drew attention to the identity of *mumukur* and *śrāddha* in *Oudheidkundig Verslag*, 1916, p. 115. See also Dr. P. V. van Stein Callenfels, *ibidem*, 1919, p. 105 ff.

¹⁵ It seems to indicate a high tower of offerings and should be read *pusadi*.

¹⁶ The word *madya* is perhaps preserved in the Javanese word *mader-ēngga*, a kind of trifold throne, used on special occasions in the palace of the Susuhunan of Surakarta.

the poet speaks of the ceremony called in Bali *mumukur* or *ngĕm-adya*, which corresponds perfectly with the further description and meaning of the *śrāddha* ceremony.

Then follows the description of the priests who attend to the festival, their *mudrās* (gestures of the hands), spells, prayers, etc., and of the ceremony itself:

*tanggal ping rwa wēlas mangiñjēm irika swah sūtrapātheniwō /
mwang homārccana len pariśrama samāpte prāpta ning swah muwah /
sang hyang puṣpa yinoga ring wēngi linakwan supratīṣṭha kriyā /
pōh ning dhyāna samādhi siddhi kinēnākēn de mahāsthāpaka // 5 //*

“On the twelfth of the month the canonical text for summoning (the souls) to heaven was read; further offerings (were made) and ceremonies (held), upon the completion of which heaven was reached. The holy *puṣpa* was animated by means of *yoga* at night.¹⁷ The ceremony of correct erection was held. The effect of *dhyāna*, *samādhi*, and *siddhi* was assured by the *mahāsthāpaka*.” A description of the next day’s festival follows, consisting of the presentation of differently shaped offerings and alms. The offerings were probably made of fruits and foods and were afterwards divided between the personages present. Finally various dances were held.

In canto 67, where the end of the ceremony is described, another important passage is found. It runs as follows:

*prajñāpāramitā tēmah nira n-umantuk ring mahābuddhaloka /
sang hyang puṣpaśarīra śighra linarut sāmpun mulih sopakāra /*

“The incarnation of *Prajñāpāramitā* (= the Queen Grandmother) returned into the great Buddha-heaven. The holy *puṣpaśarīra* soon drifted away. The offerings were already returned.”¹⁸ Here-with the ceremony was finished.

¹⁷ Kern translates: “The holy *Puṣpa* was summoned by *yoga*.” I think that *yinoga* means “animated by means of *yoga*.” Kern’s translation must be incorrect as the *puṣpa* is a puppet, made by the priest—a fact, however, Kern did not know. Later on in Canto 67.2.3 it is called *puṣpaśarīra* and it is said to drift away (in the water). I connect *wēngi* with the first part of the verse because on Bali the ceremony of the animation of the *puṣpaśarīra* is held at night.

¹⁸ Kern translates: “The divine *Puṣpaśarīra*, soon sent away, already turned back with homage.” But *linarut* (passive form of *larut*), is always used for drifting in water. This may be also intended here, since the *puṣpaśarīra* on Bali is in fact thrown into the water after being burned. *Sopa-*

It cannot be denied that the ceremony described by Prapañca must be a Buddhist version of the Balinese *mumukur* or *ngĕmadya*. The mention of *madhya*, *puṣpaśarīra*, and other striking features cannot be misunderstood. The poet, however, does not stop with the end of the ceremony, but immediately tells us that the king ordered the repair of the sanctuary of Kamal Paṇḍak, officially called Prajñāpāramitāpurī. For it was the intention to make it the *caṇḍi* of the Queen Grandmother. The ceremony of consecrating the image of the goddess Prajñāpāramitā, which would be the point of contact with the deceased royal personage, was conducted by the priest Śrī Jñānawidhi (*prajñāpāramitākriyenulahakĕn śrī-jñānawidhiyapraṭiṣṭha*) and the sanctuary, situated in the still existing village Bhayālangö (now called Bayalangu), was newly named Wiṣeṣapura. There the Queen Grandmother was worshipped every month of Bhādra (mid-August till mid-September) on the anniversary of the day on which she reached heaven.¹⁹ This sanctuary, too, still exists; it must have been very simple and contained a statue of Prajñāpāramitā placed on a stone terrace under a wooden roof on four poles. The head of this statue has disappeared; hence we cannot know the features of the royal grandmother. But the whole, together with the description in the poem, is most important material for us in reconstructing the old Javanese entombment procedure.

Looking over the facts given by our poet and combining them with what is known about the Balinese *mumukur*, we are able to give the following outline.

The ceremony of deliverance from all earthly bonds was held in the palace in almost the same way as to-day on Bali. A *madhya* was made, a *puṣpaśarīra* used and afterwards thrown into the water,

kāra should perhaps be translated "offerings" (see Van der Tuuk, *Kawi-Balinesesch-Nederlandsch woordenboek*, sub voce). After each ceremony the offerings on Bali are still taken home by the offerers. *Sopakāra* might have meant a special kind of offerings, for in the next verse of this strophe the poet speaks about the distribution of other offerings (*caru* etc.) among the servants.

¹⁹ I believe that in Canto 69 only one sanctuary is meant, and not two, as assumed by my colleagues. Only it was consecrated two times and received another name on the second occasion. The very old priest Jñānawidhi (is this the 83 year-old *mahāsthāpaka* of Canto 64.4.1?) is said to have presided at the consecration both times.

and several offerings, which are still known on Bali in the same shape, presented. Immediately after this, however, was held another ceremony, which no longer takes place on Bali, perhaps because there are now no independent ruling kings. It was the consecration of an image of the deceased in a *canḍi*; the shape of this statue was that of the god or goddess of whom the deceased royal personage was considered to be an incarnation. Every year on the anniversary of the first ceremony (the deliverance of the soul from all earthly bonds) this statue was worshipped.

Meanwhile it has become clear that the entombing of old Javanese kings was not a Hinduistic practice grown in course of time more and more Indonesian, but a thoroughly Indonesian ceremony, which on Java and Bali took a Hinduistic form and should be considered as a higher form of the analogous ceremonies of the Dayaks and other Indonesian peoples not influenced by the Hindus. Yet even from a Hinduistic point of view everything was right. There was an image of a god of whom the deceased king was an incarnation. Although the Hindus never made an image for this special occasion, they could hardly have objected to it, for the statue could be considered a real image of the god, serving at the same time as a memorial statue. But for the Indonesian people it meant more, as it is almost certain that the image worshipped was in fact the same thing as the *puṣpaśarīra*, but only in a more permanent form. And that the *puṣpaśarīra*, must be considered as a Balinese counterpart of the *pantak* of Borneo, is to be deduced from the comparison already given above.²⁰ So we can conclude that the old Indonesian practice of summoning the souls of the chiefs by means of skulls or wooden figures acquired a higher and more cultivated expression through accepting the Hinduistic dogma of the *avatāra*, the incarnation of gods in human beings.

Nevertheless, the question put at the beginning of my article is not yet wholly answered, as it remains to be made acceptable that just the Hindu temple was the right spot for establishing contact with the ancestors. The answer, however, can be given quickly.

It may be well known to the reader that among the Indonesian peoples a tendency is found to place the land of the souls in an

²⁰ Is it perhaps probable that the custom of leading a bull round the *madya* at the *mumukur* ceremony on Bali is a survival of the bull-slaughter at the corresponding *tiwah* festival on Borneo?

uninhabited and inaccessible country. For the inhabitants of small islands it is situated in the feared and unknown neighbor islands. On islands without mountains it lies in barren and uninhabited plains. On mountainous islands, however, it is placed on the mountains. It must have been so before, and is still partly so in Java and Bali. Even now in the Muhammadan period graves are dug on mountaintops and most of the holy men of Java are buried on hills.

Is it astonishing then to see the Hindu temple, which is a replica of the "mountain of mountains," regarded as the proper dwelling-place for the king's soul in case he is summoned to sojourn a few hours among his relatives? I think it is not.

The relation between the old Indonesian land of souls and the old Javanese *candi* will be still clearer when we introduce the *wayang kulit*, the Javanese shadow play, that encyclopedia for Javanese thought. As the reader already knows, the performance of this play takes place on a white cloth screen, on which is thrown the shadow of various flat leather puppets. Offerings, put near the performer, tell us that the play has some magical significance and the study of the repertoire, the puppets, the names, and other features has already shown clearly that the whole performance originally must have been the summoning of ancestors for magical purposes. But in course of time it has grown into the mere entertainment which it is now.

Thus the puppets are to be considered as the ancestors of the kings now living and the whole scene as the land of souls. A special indication of this is the appearance of a remarkable piece of finely carved leatherwork in front of the screen at the beginning and at the end of each part of the performance. This piece is called *gunungan* (mountain-piece) or *kékayon* (tree-piece). It has the shape of a leaf and is decorated with the design of a big tree, populated by birds and other animals, which emerges from behind a closed and well-guarded gateway. Between the gateway and the tree is a pond with fish. Tree, pond, and gateway stand on mountains.

Elsewhere I have already pointed to the fact that this *gunungan* has to be understood as a representation of the "mountain of mountains," Meru, and therefore is to be considered as the two-dimensional expression of the same idea that is expressed by the

caṇḍi in a three-dimensional way.²¹ This is true only if seen in the light of Hinduistic culture. For our purpose, however, it is necessary to lay particular stress on the Indonesian part, and for this purpose we must examine once more our non-Hinduistic sources.

There we find the statement that on top of a mountain, where the Dayaks locate the land of their ancestors, the tree of life (*batang garing*) grows, and water of life (*danum kakiringan*) is found. The rivers of that land are crammed full of fish and the forests are alive with animals (see the fish in the pond of the *gunungan* and the tree with the animals on it). Most interesting, however, is the fact that the pond with the water of life is found there, because in a certain period of the Hindu-Javanese culture the building of *caṇḍis* for entombing the ashes of the kings was replaced by the constructing of watertanks fed by a small mountain-stream. These basins were adorned with reliefs and images and under their surface was hidden the stone casket with the ashes, magic stones, and metals. Therefore, the water of such a pond was holy and could be called water of life.²²

In fact, the whole description of the land of souls could be replaced by that of the *gunungan* or the *caṇḍi*. Even the guarded gateway is to be found in the Dayak conception of heaven. There is a stone gateway called *batu balawang*, affording entrance to the *Tiong kandang*, the mountain of souls of the Landak Dayak. The walls of this gateway are said to collapse if an impure soul tries to enter; perhaps the same idea may be the origin of what is told about the gateway of *caṇḍi* Suku, situated near Surakarta on Java. If an impure woman should try to pass, her skirt would be torn.

Thus the *gunungan* may be considered the connecting link between the Hinduistic *caṇḍi*, the mountain of the gods, on one side, and the Indonesian land of souls, mountainous and populated with almost heavenly beings, on the other side.

²¹ See "Oost-Java en de hemelberg," *Djawa*, 1926, p. 333 ff.

²² For instance, the tomb-tanks of Erlangga and of Udayana on the mountain Pénanggungan. See *Pictorial History of Civilization in Java*, Weltevreden, Kolff and Co., 1926, Figs. 78 and 76. The vivifying quality of the water spouting from such tomb-tanks, is indicated by the gargoyles. Sometimes the water spouts from the breasts of a goddess, sometimes from the *amṛta*-jars and often the whole scene is decorated with representations from the story of Garuḍa and the *amṛta*. [Cf. my discussion of the divinities of sacred springs, to appear in *Yakṣas*, Part. II. A. K. C.]

I hope that herewith the meaning of the Hindu Javanese *candi* has been demonstrated, judged not merely by its outward shape, but also by its inner values. It is neither a Hindu temple nor a truly Hinduistic building, though its shape and ornaments are Hindu in origin. It is a thoroughly Indonesian monument, based on purely Indonesian conceptions. And on the whole it is a brilliant example of the way Hindu influences were accepted and digested by the Indonesians.

A NEW CHINESE BRONZE IN THE UNIVERSITY MUSEUM, PHILADELPHIA

HELEN E. FERNALD

UNIVERSITY MUSEUM, PHILADELPHIA

WHEN IN CHINA during the summer of 1929 I purchased for the University Museum, Philadelphia, a bronze wine jar, or *tsun*, which was said to have been recently excavated (Plate I). It exhibits a number of exceedingly interesting features.

In general it is typical of the so-called Shang bronzes, having a wide band of rich decoration in relief around the middle of the body while the high beaker mouth and spreading base are plain. Inside on the bottom is the typical Shang inscription.

But it is unusual both on account of its squat shape and its spotty patina. This patina is in gray green patches over large areas of a brown madder color, while here and there are areas which appeared to have traces of gilding but are in reality only the polished metal itself. The squat shape is surprising, the *tsun* nearly fits into a square, being seven and one-eighth inches high and the lip seven inches in diameter.

Several *tsun* of this type in the National Museum in Peking are assigned to the Shang Dynasty by the experts who have just published the catalogue.¹ They are all taller and more slender and graceful. In the matter of the design, called an ogre face, or *t'ao-t'ieh*, ours is almost identical with one of these as well as with a number of other well-known very early bronzes. I have grouped together here (Plate II) outline drawings of several to show the striking similarities of these with the mask from our bronze. All are alike in being close to the original naturalistic design, for each part has real meaning. Conventionality has set in, but the original significance of each feature and the relationship of each to the whole has not yet been lost. Even the upper lips draw back from the nostrils in a real snarl. This is one of the first features to lose its significance. The eyebrow is another. Compare with these an ogre mask from a Han bronze in the Sumitomo Collection (Plate

¹ *Pao wen lou i ch'i t'u lu*, by Ma Heng and others, referred to as "Peking Catalogue".

III, Fig. I). The deterioration of the design is evident, the different features have lost their meaning and all are disjointed. The little scroll shape floating off by itself from the nostril is all that is left of the snarling upper lip; the eyebrow seems to have fallen between the eye and the ear; the significance of the unit on each side of the horn is not apparent at all. It is an example of the artistic decadence of a design which originally was strong and full of meaning. I intend to show, in another paper, how a classification of bronzes along this line may aid eventually in establishing a criterion for dating within the limits of the two widely separated periods illustrated here.

That the mask on our bronze belongs artistically to the early days of the design is obvious when we look at it again (Plate IV, Fig. 1). This photograph also shows to some extent the beauty of the modelling which is in three planes; that of the low, but crisp and delicate, scroll work over the background, that of the face between the features, and that of the high relief of horns, eyebrows, eyes, etc. The workmanship is very fine. The little head between the horns is a triumph in itself; its eyes and nostrils are in very high relief and stick out like buttons, being actually somewhat undercut. I think this has been done with a chisel but it is almost the only place where the use of a tool can be detected. Another mask design decorates the back of the vessel and on each side stand two birds facing each other (Plate IV, Fig. 2). The bird represented is certainly the phoenix showing the crest, the "snake-like" neck, and the "fish" tail in a very simple and archaic manner. The drawing shows this more distinctly (Plate V, Fig. 1). The directness of this design also seems to me to place it earlier than some other similar ones known to us, for instance, that of Plate V, Fig. 3, in which the artist has become more conscious of his flowing lines than of the bird form, and Fig. 2 of the same plate, which shows many of the same characteristics of deterioration. Mr. Yetts places the bronze of Fig. 2 tentatively in Chou while the other, Fig. 3, is doubtful but bears a Shang inscription, and so claims to be early. It seems to me very self-conscious in its design, quite unlike the first beautifully modelled but childlike conception, or even the bird of Plate V, Fig. 4, which comes from one of the Yu of the Tuan Fang altar set. Parts of this set may be Shang. This Yu is, at the latest, of late Chou dynasty and already the signs

of decadence are present. We cannot but feel that the bird of Fig. 1 is the earliest design of them all.

This *tsun* appears to have been cast by the method Mr. Yetts describes as the second lost-wax process, the one in which the wax model was made by means of a mould. The slight inaccuracy of adjustment between two sections of the mould may be observed along the line between the two birds (Plate IV, Fig. 2). One joint of the mould evidently ran vertically here—one can trace it out even through the string courses—another such joint can be traced down through the middle of the mask. The mould was consequently in at least four sections for the outside. Inside, the neck comes down to a sort of edge at about the level of the string courses and overhangs the larger bulbous interior. One can make out inside traces of three plugs on the bottom which mark the places where pins were put through the wax model to hold the final firing mould of the core in place—or if the jar was cast upside down, as was probably the case, to hold up the core of the hollow base. Moulds for casting bronze vessels have been found at the Yin site of Chang-té and are of burnt brick. The mark of one of the plugs may be seen (Plate VI, Fig. 1) between the two lines of inscription; the other two are on either side and do not show on this rubbing.

The inscription (Plate VI, Fig. 1) is beautifully fashioned and is of the typical so-called Shang type. The edges are very clear and are smooth as satin. The characters are of uniform depth. They are to all appearances cast with the bronze and I can nowhere see the least trace of a tool. The inscription may be read *shou tso fu kêng pao tsun i kung*, "Shou made Father Kêng a precious wine-jar sacrificial-vessel," then follows the sign of a bow.

This inscription is closely similar to that on the Shang Dynasty Yu in the Peking Museum already mentioned, which has a mask design so like the one on our *tsun* (Plate VI, Fig. 2). Here we can compare the two inscriptions. The name of the maker is not the same; this is dedicated to Father Hsin instead of Father Kêng and the coat of arms, as it appears to be, at the end is different; for it seems to me likely that these pictorial signs, especially those in a *ya*, as this framework is called, were used much as coats of arms or trade marks are used. A bow or arrow or some such symbol of the hunt seems to have been a favorite for this purpose and we find many examples given in Juan Yüan's book.

In regard to the character 𠂔 (*i*) I was struck, in looking through Juan Yüan's work² and the *Chin shih* so, by the pictorial nature of this symbol (Plate III, Fig. 2, a-h) and could not believe it was the same as that described by Chalfant (who quoted the *Shuo Wên*) as representing a pig's snout, millet, the silk symbol, and the hands (Fig. 2. k). It represented rather a twig held in hands with something hanging to the top, almost like a tall flower stem with the symbol for *ch'ang*, "spirit or ghost," alighting on it. But some of the forms seemed clearly bird forms.

Yang I-sun, Wu Ta-ch'eng, Lo Chên-yü, Hopkins (*JRAS* 1925, p. 451), and Yetts (*Chinese Bronzes*, p. 24) subscribe to the bird interpretation. The fact that I arrived at the same conclusion quite independently, before I knew that others had believed the same thing, tends to convince me that the theory is correct. In fact the scores of examples do, as Hopkins says,³ "make it plain what the intention of the designers of the primitive character was."

Yetts says (*Catalogue of the Bronzes . . . in the Eumorfopoulos Collection*, Vol. I, p. 24) that Lo Chên-yü notes two examples from the Honan bones as, "Two hands holding a cock, agreeing with ancient forms on bronzes; but what the significance of this is we cannot tell". Yetts does not attempt to explain it further, nor does Hopkins.

Since *i* still means not only "vessel" but "sacrificial vessel", it seems clear that "hands holding up a cock" was the early sign for sacrifice—most appropriately, as the cock was doubtless the commonest animal for offerings.

Yetts in describing the pictogram says, "a bird, held by two hands, and grains of rice dropping from its beak". Is it not likely that the "grains of rice" are simply two marks to indicate that there are two birds being offered, one in each hand? It is true that in some examples the marks = are shown almost in the birds' open beaks. And sometimes there are three marks. But they might be simply indications of the plural as in the familiar "sons and grandsons" (Plate III, Fig. 2, m.).

The modern form of *i* is derived obviously from the Seal Character form as published in the *Shuo wên* about 100 A. D. How did the change come about? There may have been two original signs

² *Chi ku chai chung ting i chi kuan shih.*

³ *JRAS*, 1925, p. 457.

for *i*, of which the one in bird form was dropped while the pig snout form persisted and descends to us in the modern character. It may also be that there were not two separate origins for the word *i*, but that carelessness in making the character or loss of significance resulting from copying and recopying through a long period of time led to the misunderstanding concerning its significance. That the transformation from a bird to the snout of a pig, millet, and silk might have occurred thus by accident is demonstrated in an example taken from the *Po-ku-t'u-lu* (Plate III, Fig. 2, i-j). On the body of the vessel, supposedly of Chou period, the designer did not seem very certain of what he was writing—he was probably just copying lines—and when he came to the character on the cover he got it even further away from the original bird. It is possible to understand how such a character might be mistaken for the set of articles mentioned in the *Shuo wên* from which has descended the modern form. I do not say that it did happen thus, but the possibility should be borne in mind.

The patination, as I have stated, is very spotty. This is fully explained by the analysis of the bronze made from a piece which had been broken out of the foot when the vessel was excavated. The analysis and the micro-photography were carried out by Dr. Graham of the University of Pennsylvania, who has been doing similar work with the Ur material. Mr. Yetts, for reasons too lengthy to state here, is of the opinion that no conclusive evidence can be gotten out of analysis of the metal of Chinese bronzes. I agree that certainly it will not be a quick easy method for proving the genuineness of a bronze or establishing its age. But any scientific study must include data of every kind, for the value of such data cannot always be foreseen, and one cannot state that it is useless until it has been done. Who knows what results one could get from the accumulated data were all Chinese bronzes analysed? No one analysis will prove anything, but with a great mass of material there may appear some unexpected correlation between composition of metal, design, and inscription.

Dr. Graham reports that the metal of this bronze is very brittle, porous, and quite ununiform, indicating rather crude methods of smelting and casting.

The analysis showed the following percentages:

Copper	. . .	82.39%
Tin	. . .	15.42
Lead45
Gold38
Iron09
Sulphur15
Residue	. . .	1.20

The total shows an error of 0.8 of a per cent., a slight inaccuracy unavoidable in such an analysis as this. It should be deducted from the copper and tin percentages. It will be seen that the copper and tin are in the relative proportion of $5\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. (It is interesting incidentally to note that this is true to ancient tradition as laid down in the *Chou li*.) The lead, gold and iron are common impurities in certain copper ores.

The high percentage of sulphur was a great surprise. Dr. Graham states that it could have come from a sulphur ore which had not been completely treated to remove the sulphur, or it could have come from sulphur in the fuel used in smelting. It would be sufficient in itself, in an alloy of this nature, to produce a very porous structure and together with the large amount of insoluble material, or residue, shows the high impurity of the alloy. Dr. Graham is of the opinion that all except the copper and tin were in this alloy unintentionally, as a consequence of either carelessness or lack of technical knowledge. In view of the evident care taken with the design, its delicacy and beauty of workmanship, it would seem likely that the bronze workers did not know of the presence of the impurities, or at least did not know how to get rid of them.

Dr. Graham has made also a metallographic examination which proves conclusively that the metal was crudely refined. The photograph reproduced in Plate VII, Fig. 1, shows the porous structure of the unetched polished metal, a porosity due to dissolved gases in the metal when cast and the high sulphur percentage.

Fig. 2 of the same plate shows a section of the etched metal. It reveals the typical structure of cast metal, the grains at different angles staining, or etching, differently. The network throughout, seen very clearly in the central grain, is chiefly copper sulphide impurity. It is this, with the porosity, that makes the bronze so brittle. There is a great deal of slag on the surface—see the dark mass

on the upper edge—and it is this, largely, which contributes to the unusual spotty appearance of the patina. The presence of gold is not apparent in the pictures and it was probably not known to the metal workers. It is a natural impurity in copper ore. I mention this gold particularly because it is said by the Chinese that the gold in the alloy comes to the surface and gives the bronze that golden glint which they call *fei ch'ing* and which I at first took to be gilding. Dr. Graham states emphatically that the gold does no such thing and there is not enough of it anyway to cause such an effect. The golden glint, he thinks, might be due to the impurities present.

The vessel weighs exactly four pounds, or 1.81 kilograms.

Further work at Chang-té Fu is likely to help us in establishing a more definite date for these early bronzes. In the meantime, we can do much toward increasing our knowledge in grouping them. This example appears to belong to the group generally known as the Shang type and may eventually be located somewhere between the twelfth and the tenth century B. C.



CHINESE BRONZE TSUN IN THE UNIVERSITY MUSEUM, PHILADELPHIA.




Fig. 1.




Fig. 2.




Fig. 3.




Fig. 4.

Fig. 5.

PLATE II. DRAWINGS OF MASK DESIGNS FROM VARIOUS ANCIENT BRONZES.

Fig. 1, Tsun in University Museum; Fig. 2, Tsun, Peking Museum, Peking Cat., Vol. II, p. 99;
 Fig. 3, Ting, Eumorfopoulos Collection, Yvettes, Pl. I; Fig. 4, Po Ku T'u Lu, Vol. I, p. 32;
 Fig. 5, Yu, Peking Museum, Peking Cat., Vol. II, p. 98.




Fig. 1. Mask design from a Hu in the Sumitomo Collection, "Collection of Chinese Bronze Antiques", portfolio, Plate 46.




Fig. 2. Early Forms of the Character "I".

a-h, Bird forms on Shang and Chon Bronzes: i-j, An example of careless or ignorant copying; k, l, Seal form of 100 A.D.; m, The common symbols for "sons and grandsons".




Fig. 1. Low relief depicting ogre mask, or T'ao-t'ieh.



Fig. 2. Low Relief depicting two phoenix birds.



Fig. 1.



Fig. 2.



Fig. 3.



Fig. 4.

PLATE V. DRAWINGS OF BIRD DESIGNS FROM ANCIENT BRONZES.

Fig. 1, Tsun, University Museum. Fig. 2, Yu, Eumorfopoulos Collection, Yelts, A 27.

Fig. 3, Chih, Eumorfopoulos Collection, Yelts, A 8.

Fig. 4, Yu. Tuan Fang "Altar Set", Metropolitan Museum.




Fig. 1. Rubbing of the Inscription
on the Shang Tsun in the
University Museum.




Fig. 2. Rubbing of the Inscription
on the Shang Yu in the
Peking Museum.




Fig. 1. Micro-photograph of the surface of the unetched polished metal showing porous structure. Magnification about 50.




Fig. 2. Micro-photograph of a section of the etched metal showing mass of impurity at the edge, near the top, and a network of impurity through the grains. Magnification about 100.

CONFUCIUS AND HSÜN-TZŪ *

HERRLEE GLESSNER CREEL

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

A CONTROVERSY some two thousand years old is continued by Dr. Homer H. Dubs in a recent article entitled "*Nature*" in the *Teaching of Confucius*.¹ In the course of his discussion Dr. Dubs disagrees, on a number of points, with positions stated by the writer in a recently published study.²

Dr. Dubs reiterates the stand which he took in the companion volume to his translation of *Hsün-tzŭ*,³ and brings additional evidence to support his thesis that "Hsüntze developed more carefully than Mencius the true meaning of Confucius, and consequently had really a greater influence than Mencius in determining the inner nature of the later Confucian development."⁴ Specifically he insists that "with respect to his doctrine of human nature, Hsüntze must be regarded as quite as orthodox as Mencius."⁵ The celebrated statement of Hsün-tzŭ that "The nature of man is evil"⁶ does not, according to Dr. Dubs, constitute a break with Confucius, since "Confucius did not make any statement about the nature of human nature."⁷ The writer's position, on the other hand, has been that Mencius, in holding human nature to be good, was in essential agreement both with the explicit statement and with the entire philosophy of Confucius. More fundamentally he has held that the total philosophical orientation of Hsün-tzŭ stands in marked contrast to that of Confucius.⁸

* The writer is indebted to Professor K. T. Mei, of Harvard University, for valuable suggestions and for his kindness in reading and criticizing this manuscript.

¹ *JAOS*. 50. 233-7.

² *Sinism: A Study of the Evolution of the Chinese World-view* (Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1929).

³ *Hsüntze, the Moulder of Ancient Confucianism* (London: Arthur Probsthain, 1927), pp. 78, 291, etc.

⁴ *JAOS*. 50. 237.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 235.

⁶ H. H. Dubs: *The Works of Hsüntze* (London: Arthur Probsthain, 1928), p. 301.

⁷ *JAOS*. 50. 235.

⁸ One criticism made by Dr. Dubs would seem to be merely the result of

Dr. Dubs says, "Hsüntze does not however mean by the evil of human nature that it is vicious, nor did he show any Augustinian contempt of human nature, as Dr. Creel says."⁹ Perhaps it is so, but in Dr. Dubs' own translation of Hsün-tzū (from which doubtful passages have been carefully expunged) we find that he said: "But man today is without good teachers and laws; so he is selfish, vicious, and unrighteous. He is without the rules of proper conduct (*Li*) and justice (*Yi*), so there is rebellion, disorder, and no good government. In ancient times the Sage-Kings knew that man's nature was evil, selfish, vicious, unrighteous, rebellious, and of itself did not bring about good government."¹⁰ Consultation of the text does not indicate that Dr. Dubs has translated this passage other than correctly.

Dr. Dubs is right in his insistence on Hsün-tzū's optimism with regard to the "infinite improvability" of human nature. Unquestionably he has here pointed out an omission in the writer's treatment of Hsün-tzū; this is without doubt only one of many points on which the writer should have to defer to Dr. Dubs' superior knowledge, as a specialist, of Hsün-tzū.

On the other hand, further study makes Dr. Dubs' opinion of the place of Hsün-tzū in Chinese philosophy, and particularly of his relation to Confucius, less acceptable than ever. The main points which he raises in his article are two. The first of these has to do with the translation and interpretation of two passages in the *Analec*s, VI, 17, and XVII, 2.

Since the interpretation to which he objects is attributed by Dr. Dubs to Chu Hsi,¹¹ the writer has consulted, on these passages,

an oversight. He says, "Dr. Creel is forced by his view to the *reductio ad absurdum* that this philosopher, the clearest thinker Confucianism ever produced, was both 'the least traditionally-minded of his fellows' and 'the most rigid authoritarian'" (*ibid.*, pp. 236-237). Consultation of Dr. Dubs' reference shows, however, that the complete sentence, of which he quoted only part, was: "As he was, in his opinions, the least traditionally-minded of his fellows, he was, in his theory of education, the most rigid authoritarian." (*Sinism*, p. 90).

⁹ *JAOS.* 50. 236. The writer did not once mention Augustine on the pages to which Dr. Dubs refers (*Sinism*, pp. 90, 87), nor in his entire treatment of Hsün-tzū, nor, in so far as he can determine, in the entire book.

¹⁰ Duhs: *The Works of Hsüntze*, p. 302.

¹¹ *JAOS.* 50. 235.

the thirty-nine pre-Sung commentaries on the *Analects* contained in the 玉函山房輯佚書,¹² as well as those in the 皇侃義疏 and in the 論語集解 of 何晏. Together these include, it is believed, the bulk if not the whole of commentary on the *Analects* written prior to the Sung dynasty and now current.

Analects XVII, 2, is translated by Legge: "The Master said, 'By nature, men are nearly alike; by practice, they get to be wide apart'." It is certainly true that this statement, by itself, does not say whether human nature is good or evil. Only if taken in connection with VI, 17, does it add strength to the argument that Confucius thought well of original human nature. Not only, however, is the passage itself inconclusive in this respect, but the few remarks on it which we find in the pre-Sung commentaries are likewise.¹³ We may, then, follow Dr. Dubs' lead in laying aside this passage, to have its significance determined on the basis of our decision, on other grounds, as to Confucius' view of human nature.

The passage which Dr. Dubs rightly calls "crucial" is VI, 17. Legge translates it: "The Master said, 'Man is born for uprightness. If a man lose his uprightness, and yet live, his escape from death is the effect of mere good fortune'." Not accepting this, Dr. Dubs says: "We venture a translation: 'A man's life is usually¹⁴ upright; but, if entangled (in evil), that man is fortunate to escape (calamity)'. This passage therefore says nothing about original human nature without unjustifiable pressing."¹⁵

The writer does not accept this translation but it seems inescapable to him that, even as Dr. Dubs renders the passage, it defeats his own purpose. The writer's position, to which Dr. Dubs takes exception, was stated by him as follows: "Dr. Creel has found Confucius to have taught explicitly that all things, including

¹² Collected c. 1874, edited by 馬國翰.

¹³ *Yü Han Shan Fang Chi I Shu*: vol. 42, *Lun Yü K'ung Shih Hsün Chieh*, chüan 9, p. 1b; vol. 44, *Lun Yü Shih I*, p. 8b; vol. 45, *Lun Yü Fan Shih Chu*, p. 11a. *Huang K'an I Shu*, in *Ku Ching Chieh Hui Han*, vol. 32, chüan 9, pp. 2b-3b. To be sure, the *Shih I* speaks of man's nature, in one column, as 非正, but the meaning of this whole passage is obscure, and the strongest Taoist influence is evident, even being remarked by the *Yü Han* editor.

¹⁴ Taking 人 to mean 平人 (Dubs' note).

¹⁵ *JAOS*. 50. 235.

human nature, are 'properly and naturally . . . good, and it was only by perversion that they became evil'.¹⁶ Dr. Dubs says: "A man's life is *usually* upright", which comes dangerously near to *naturally*. Further, he says "if entangled (in evil), that man is fortunate to escape (calamity)". But if Confucius, like Hsün-tzū, believed that all men were evil by *nature*, this speaking of their becoming entangled in evil is meaningless. Such a statement logically presupposes a non-evil condition of human nature as its point of departure.

Finally, according to Dr. Dubs' translation, Confucius said "if entangled (in evil), that man is *fortunate* to escape (*calamity*)". Both "fortune" and "calamity" are distinctly abnormal and unnatural phenomena. They are associated, in this passage, with the evil man. We may therefore logically suppose that their opposites go together,¹⁷ and that goodness is the normal and natural state of human nature. It follows from Dr. Dubs' translation that Confucius taught that human nature is good.

Convincing, on this point, as Dr. Dubs' translation is, it is not so much so as is the generally accepted interpretation of the passage. Every Chinese commentator, ancient and modern, examined by the writer, and also Soothill, Zottoli, Couvreur, and Ku Hung Ming (while differing on minor points) agree essentially with Legge's translation, to which Dr. Dubs takes exception.

Dr. Dubs says that this passage includes "two precisely parallel phrases," making clear what he means by his arrangement of the characters in footnote 8, p. 234, as follows:

人之生也直，
罔之生也幸而免。

Within the limits of the writer's knowledge, this is a complete innovation. Certainly none of a considerable number of Chinese commentators nor any of the European translators mentioned above has understood this passage to involve parallel phrases, in Dr.

¹⁶ *JAOS*, 50, 233.

¹⁷ Be it noted that this statement does not entrap the writer in the fallacy of saying that "mis-fortune," as the opposite of "fortune," is the portion of the good man. The opposite of "fortune," as here used, is that prosperity which comes as the reward of merit. The Chinese commentators have noted this fact; cf. 論語李氏集注 on VI, 17.

Dubs' sense. To be sure, at first glance it may appear to do so, but that is often the case in Chinese where there is no real parallelism.

Further, the position involves well-nigh insuperable difficulties. If these phrases are "precisely parallel", then the characters of each pair must correspond, that is, 人 and 罔 must both be nouns, 之 and 之 must both be possessive particles, and 生 and 生 must both mean, as Dr. Dubs says, "life". What sort of translation does this give us for the passage? Something like the following: "Man's life is upright; losing's ¹⁸ life is lucky to escape". It does not seem very felicitous, yet some such translation is the inevitable result of Dr. Dubs' insistence on parallelism.

It seems apparent, however, that some, at least, of the Chinese commentators realized that still another considerable difficulty inheres in taking even the character 生 to have the same meaning in the two phrases. No one knows better than did Confucius that it is, and was, not true that "Man's life is upright". The 生 of the first phrase was therefore interpreted to mean (as it often does) "birth", and the phrase to mean "Man's birth is upright", or, more freely, "Man at birth is upright".¹⁹

Of this passage, Dr. Dubs says, "Examination of the original text and of the Chinese commentaries shows that Legge, in his translation, has followed the interpretation of Chu Hsi, who, more than any other person, brought the Chinese world to regard Hsüntze as unorthodox, and who would consequently be likely to interpret Confucius as teaching the Mencian doctrine that nature is naturally good. In order to get that interpretation, Chu Hsi has to give the character 生 two radically different meanings in two precisely parallel phrases. But the same character in the same position in parallel clauses must be taken with the same meaning, otherwise the parallelism of the clauses is defeated. In the second clause, Chu Hsi has given 生 the meaning 'life'; whereas in the first clause he makes it refer to 'birth'."²⁰

¹⁸ Any of the other translations for 罔 may be substituted, as "lack", "injure", "ensnare", etc; but in any case we must make a verbal noun and put it into the genitive; substitution of any of these others does not help matters much.

¹⁹ Legge's translation, "Man is born for uprightness", is still freer, but preserves the same idea of the normal goodness of human nature.

²⁰ *JAOS.* 50, 234-235.

This explanation might stand, were it not for the fact that such an interpretation of this passage was given by 鄭元 of the Later Han dynasty, approximately a thousand years before Chu Hsi was born. He says 始生之性皆正直, "at the beginning of life all (human) nature is correct and upright".²¹

So much for 生. There is pre-Sung authority, however, for taking it, in the first case, to mean "life". But in no Chinese commentary or translation which the writer has examined is a single character of the three in the second phrase, 罔之生, given the meaning which Dr. Dubs' parallelism would give it. 罔 is interpreted, not as a noun corresponding to 生, but as a verb meaning "lose", "lack", or "injure". 之 is taken, not as a possessive particle corresponding to the 之 of the first phrase, but as a pronoun, "it", with 直 as its antecedent. And 生 is interpreted, not as a noun corresponding to "birth" or "life", but as a verb, "to live".

By making the second 生 a noun instead of a verb, Dr. Dubs avoids an interpretation fatal to his theory. But every pre-Sung comment on this passage which the writer knows,²² and Sung and post-Sung commentators, insist that this passage means, not merely "that man is fortunate to escape (calamity)", but "his escape from premature death is only the result of good fortune". If Confucius said that the evil man is able even to remain alive only as the result of good fortune, we may certainly conclude that he believed goodness to be the normal and natural state of human nature.

Should we be justified, then, in saying that a careful study of this passage and its commentation provides a sufficient basis on which to erect a theory of the Confucian doctrine of human nature? Certainly not. Few single passages can carry such a burden. The

²¹ *Lun Yü Chêng Shih Chu*, in *Yü Han*, vol. 43, chüan 3, p. 4b. This commentary is well authenticated, since it is mentioned by Ho Yen (preface, p. 4b) and, according to the *Yü Han* editor, by the literary indices of Sui and T'ang dynasties. The *Yü Han* citation is from still another source.

²² *Yü Han*: vol. 42, *Lun Yü Pao Shih Chang Chü*, chüan 上, p. 11a-b; vol. 45, *Lun Yü Chi Shih Chi Chu*, chüan 上, p. 5b.

Lun Yü Chi Chieh (*Ma Yung*), III, p. 16a.

Huang K'an I Shu, chüan 3, p. 26a-b.

Analects was collected perhaps two generations after Confucius; slightly variant texts, for some passages, are still extant;²³ some of its passages are mutually contradictory, others are historically difficult. If *Analects* VI, 17, were conspicuously out of harmony with the total philosophy of Confucius, the writer would have no hesitation in calling its authenticity an open question. If, however, it seem in harmony with that total philosophy, the passage gives added emphasis to the proposition that Confucius, like Mencius and unlike Hsün-tzū, held human nature as such to be good. This latter proposition the writer believes to be profoundly true. He has set forth his reasons for so interpreting Confucius, as well as he was able, at a previous time. He hopes to do so more adequately in the future, but the scope of the present paper does not admit of their inclusion.

Dr. Dubs' appraisal of Mencius seems somewhat incomplete. He says: "Now Mencius taught that man's nature was naturally good; if so, what need would there be for the education and training so highly emphasized in the Confucian schools? If human nature is naturally good, let each individual develop his own nature without imposing any training upon it, and all will be well!"²⁴ He does not refer us to those parts of the text which might support these inferences, nor does he quote the statement of Mencius concerning men that "if they are well fed and warmly clad, and live in idleness, without being taught, they become almost like the birds and beasts."²⁵ On the other hand, Dr. Dubs is not alone in pointing out that Mencius did, in some respects, show a tendency to diverge from the point of view of Confucius; the writer has dwelt on the same point in detail.²⁶

The second major point which Dr. Dubs raises has to do with the esteem in which the philosophy of Hsün-tzū was held by Confucian scholars prior to Chu Hsi. He says: "As a matter of historic fact, the teaching of Hsüntze continued to be regarded as orthodox by the Chinese for more than a millenium. In the ninth century, Han Yü, although he criticized Hsüntze as not having

²³ The 古論語 text for the first part of VI, 17, is 子曰人生也直. This does not seem to make any important difference. (Cf. *Yü Han*, chüan 41, p. 11a).

²⁴ *JAOS.* 50, 236.

²⁵ *Mencius*, III (1), 4, 8.

²⁶ Cf. *Sinism*, pp. 82-83.

transmitted perfectly the Confucian teaching, nevertheless said of his writings that they were 'mostly pure, with only small flaws'. It was not until the time of Chu Hsi, three centuries later, that Hsüntze was definitely declared to be unorthodox, and Mencius to be the correct interpreter of Confucius".²⁷

This reads as if there had been a Confucian pope, capable of hurling bans of excommunication. If Chu Hsi was such a figure, there was not such another before his time. Yet there was a kind of canonization, which may serve us as a criterion of the respective prestige of Mencius and Hsün-tzū. They were, it is true, admitted to the Confucian temple in the same year, c. 1084.²⁸ But here the resemblance ends. Mencius (as the memorial asking his admittance shows) had previously had a temple of his own, and at this time he was given the most honored place that could have been accorded him. His image was placed above those of all, save one, of the immediate disciples of the Master, and he was caused to share the choicest offerings in company only with Confucius himself and with Yen Yüan, the chief of his personal disciples—he at whose death Confucius cried, "Heaven is destroying me!"²⁹ At the same time, Mencius was given the title of 公 (duke) of 芻國. Hsün-tzū's image, however, was placed, with that of two others, "among the twenty-two worthies, of the class of Tso Ch'iu Ming".³⁰ Hsün-tzū was given the title of 伯 (earl) of 蘭陵, a rank two degrees lower than that conferred on Mencius.³¹

It should be noted that this signal preferment of Mencius above Hsün-tzū could not possibly have been due to the influence of Chu Hsi, since it happened some forty-five years before his birth.

The number of commentaries is significant. Before the Sung dynasty (and probably until the nineteenth century) only one complete commentary on the book of Hsün-tzū had been written,³²

²⁷ *J.A.O.S.* 50, 235.

²⁸ 文獻通考, chüan 44.

²⁹ *Analects*, XI, 8.

³⁰ 文獻通考, chüan 44. Also, *Sung Shih*, chüan 105. The writer is indebted to Dr. John K. Shryock, of the University of Pennsylvania, for bringing these references to his attention.

³¹ Hsün-tzū was removed from the Confucian temple, c. 1530, and has had no place there in recent centuries. Cf. *Ming Shih*, chüan 50.

³² Cf. 梁啓超: 要籍解題及其讀法, p. 93, and 漢文大系第十五卷, 荀子集解卷首, 序, p. 2.

and this not until the T'ang dynasty, so little, apparently, was the scholarly interest which it attracted. On *Mencius*, on the other hand, the *Yü Han* collection³³ alone lists and quotes from nine pre-Sung commentaries, five from the Later Han dynasty, one from the Chin dynasty, and three from the T'ang dynasty.

Finally, we have direct evidence from the T'ang period concerning the esteem in which Hsün-tzū was held in that day, and what had been the attitude of previous centuries. It comes from no less unimpeachable a source than Yang Liang, the first and the only early commentator on *Hsün-tzū*. Since he gave a considerable portion of his life to this book, and since his preface is devoted chiefly to a plea for greater popularity for Hsün-tzū, we may well suppose that he would have given as favorable an account of that philosopher's reputation as the facts could warrant. In the preface to his commentary, written c. 819, he said:

"*Mencius* has the commentary of Chao-shih (i. e., Chao ch'í), and in the Han dynasty a state professorship was established, devoted to this book. It is handed down and studied in unbroken continuity. Therefore many of the scholars of the present day are fond of this book. Only *Hsün-tzū* has as yet no commentary. Again and again sections of the book are lost, and errors are introduced in copying. Although the curious do occasionally look over the work, when they find that the style is not clear they frequently close the book. When reasoning is lucid, the mind is pleased, but when the style is confused it offends the understanding. Those who do not realize this call it heterodox and do not read it. Those who examine it do not finish it, because of the omissions and errors. This is why, for a thousand years, Hsün-shih's book has not been well known".³⁴

This seems conclusive. And may we not go even further, and conjecture that that neglect of Hsün-tzū which the scholarly enthusiasm of Yang Liang and Dr. Dubs causes them to attribute to textual corruption and to Chu Hsi, respectively, really had its source in the fact that the scholars of the time saw very well the fundamental difference of Hsün-tzū's world-view from that of Confucius?

³³ Chüan 47 and 48.

³⁴ 漢文大系, chüan 15: 荀子集解卷首, pp. 74, 75; also 荀子增注卷首, p. 6.

Dr. Dubs has done a great service in focusing attention upon an original and vigorous thinker, who is in some ways the most "modern" figure that ancient China presents. But until further evidence is brought forward, the following propositions remain tenable, as hypotheses: That Hsün-tzŭ, in teaching that human nature was evil, parted company with Confucius, who, like Mencius, held the opposite position; that the importance of Hsün-tzŭ, and his influence on later Confucianism, while considerable, are not so great as Dr. Dubs, led by his scholarly interest, would have us believe.

CONFUSION IN PRAKRIT BETWEEN THE SANSKRIT PREPOSITIONS *prati* AND *pari*

M. B. EMENEAU

YALE UNIVERSITY

SANSKRIT *prati* is represented in Prakrit normally by *paḍi* (P 218)¹ or occasionally by *paḍi* (P 220). *pari* generally remains unchanged, but in Māgadhī and other Prakrits which come under this head (P 23-25) often becomes *pali* (P 256-257). In this paper I shall collect a number of cases from the published literature in which Sanskrit *pari* is represented by Prakrit *paḍi* and suggest a reason for the equivalence. Pischel knew several such cases but he emended, and evidently in his material there were so few cases that the matter escaped his otherwise meticulous attention. In § 564 of his grammar he says: 'paḍiuttha (R 4, 50), wofür nach C zu lesen sein wird pariuttha', and in § 302: 'parisakkāi (H. R. [Text falsch paḍi°])'. Both these words I shall have occasion to treat later. Siegfried Goldschmidt in the index to his edition of the *Rāvaṇavaha*, p. 168, says that *paḍi* (*prati*) is often found for *pari*, and in note 2 to that page expands this statement as follows:

¹ The following abbreviations have been used:

R = *Rāvaṇavaha oder Setubandha*. Ed. Siegfried Goldschmidt, Strassburg, 1880.

Erz = *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭri*. Von H. Jacobi, Leipzig, 1886.

Meyer = John Jacob Meyer, *Hindu Tales*, London, 1909. (Transl. of Erz.)

H = *Hāla, Saptasātakam*. Ed. A. Weber, Leipzig, 1881. (AKM vii. 4.)

śak = Pischel, *Kālidāsa's Śakuntalā*. 2nd ed., Cambridge Mass., 1922.

Mṛcch = *Mṛcchakaṭikā*. Ed. Stenzler, Bonn, 1847. Ed. Nārāyaṇa Bālakṛiṣṇa Goḍābole, Bombay, 1896.

B = *Bhavisatta Kaha von Dhaṇavāla*. Ed. H. Jacobi, München, 1918. (Abh. d. Bayerischen Ak. d. Wiss., Ph.-hist. Kl., xxix. 4.)

K = *Kālakācāryakathānakam*. Ed. H. Jacobi, Leipzig, 1880. (ZDMG 34, 247-318.)

A = *Aupapātika Sūtra*. Ed. Ernst Leumann, Leipzig, 1883. (AKM viii. 2.)

P = Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Strassburg, 1900.

PSM = Pandit Hargovind Das T. Sheth's *Pāṇi-Sadda-Mahāṇṇavo*, Calcutta, 1923-1928.

I must express my thanks to Professors Edgerton and Brown for the helpful suggestions that they kindly made while this paper was in preparation.

‘zwischen diesen zwei Präfixen ist im Pkt. eine viel weiter gehende Confusion eingetreten als Hemacandra 1. 38 annimmt.’ This sūtra of Hemacandra’s grammar reads: *niṣprati oṭpari mālyasthor vā*, and means that optionally *nis* can be interchanged with *o* when the word *mālya* follows, i. e., in combination, and *prati* can be interchanged with *pari* when the verbal root *sthā* follows in combination. As Goldschmidt indicated, the confusion is more widespread than this.

A number of cases have been collected by means of indexes to editions of Prakrit works in which *paḍi* undoubtedly stands for *pari*. More instances will probably be found as the publication of new texts proceeds and probably others could be found by reading through such unindexed texts as, e. g., those contained in the Gaekwad of Baroda’s Oriental Series. A few texts, I regret, have not been available in the libraries to which I have had access and consequently I have been unable to use a few references, which could, however, only have added confirmatory material. The equivalence in these cases is grounded on a consideration of the meaning of the two affixes. In Sanskrit, and in Prakrit also, they are kept rigidly apart, *prati* in the meaning ‘to, towards, against’, *pari* in the meanings (1) ‘round, about’, and (2) ‘very, excessively’. Where secondary meanings are involved, the Sanskrit usage as given in the lexicons has been taken as sufficient ground for considering the equivalence certain.

The instances follow:

paḍitutt̥ha = *parituṣṭa*, ppl., ‘pleased’. *Mṛcch*, Stenzler, p. 39, line 18, reads *paritutt̥ha*; Goḍabole, p. 116, *paḍi*°. All MSS. *paḍi*°. *paḍitutt̥hā gadā sahajjūdiarā*, ‘the gambling-master and the gambler have gone away well pleased’.

paḍivatta = *parivarta*, noun, ‘change’. *Mṛcch*, Stenzler, p. 168, line 5, and Goḍabole, p. 455, both read *palivatta*, though all the MSS. have *paḍi*°. *pali*° is correct since the passage is in *Cāṇḍālī* (P 24), but the MSS. evidence is valuable as showing the tendency of the standard Prakrit. *kaḍābi lāa-palivatte bhodi*, ‘perhaps there might be a change of king’.

paḍivuda = *parivṛta*, ppl., ‘surrounded’. *Mṛcch*, Stenzler, p. 106, line 1, reads *parivuda*; Goḍabole, p. 301, *paḍi*°. All MSS. *paḍi*°. The word which precedes this is corrupt, but this word is free from suspicion.

paḍisanta = *pariśrānta*, ppl., 'tired'. *R* 6. 61. *paḍisanta-kanna-ālam hatthi-ulan*, 'the herd of elephants, the flapping of whose ears has ceased through fatigue'. All MSS. *paḍi*°.

Mr̥cch, Stenzler, p. 169, line 11, Goḍabole, p. 460, have *paliśśanta*, though all MSS. read *paḍi*°. Here again, as in the case of *paḍivatta*, since the speech is in Māgadhī, the text reading is correct while the MSS. give evidence for standard Prakrit. *aṭṭhāṇa-paliśśantaṃ samaśśāśia*, 'comforting her when she was untimely wearied'. The same word is found with the same readings in *Mr̥cch*, Stenzler, p. 97, line 20, Goḍabole, p. 278. This passage also is in Māgadhī; *adhavā cakkapalivattīāe paliśśantaśśa bhālike pavahaṇe paḍibhāśedi*, 'I suppose the cart seems heavy, because I got tired turning the wheel'.

In the last passage quoted *palivattī* = *parivṛtti*, noun, 'turning', also appears in the MSS. as *paḍi*°.

Another word is undoubtedly an instance of the equivalence. *paḍipellāṇa*, noun, 'force', which occurs in two passages of *R*, has no direct Sanskrit equivalent. The adj. *paripreraka*, 'exciting, causing', is found, and the equivalent of our word would be **pariprerana*. In each passage one MS. reads *pali*°. *R* 2. 24, *sasi-maiha-paḍipellāṇa-pakkhubbhantaṃ*, 'agitated by the force of the moon's rays'. *R* 6. 32, *pavaa-bhua-ṇolliṇṇa-mahihara-paḍipellāṇa-ṇaṇṇaa-visamā*, '(the earth's surface) rough since it moved up and down with the agitation, when the mountain was pushed and pulled this way and that by the arms of the monkeys'.

Erz. 1. 5. *taṃ paḍiyariya tao taddesaṇāe paḍibuddhā parvajjāṃ paḍivajjiyā*. Meyer translates: 'While ministering to him, they suffered a spiritual awakening from his religious discourse and embraced the life of religious mendicants'. *Erz.* 31. 31. *tattha paḍilaggo Devadattāe paḍiyario*. Meyer: 'While he stayed there he was waited upon by Devadattā'. Jacobi derives *paḍiyariya* from *pari* + *car* and translates 'bedienen, pflegen'. Three of the instances of *pariyariya* in *Erz.*, namely 2. 12, 84. 33, and 85. 6, have the same meaning, while the interpretation of the fourth instance, 80. 3, is doubtful (see Meyer 269, n. 3), but has no bearing on the present problem. On 31. 31 Meyer has a note (108, n. 2) which quotes the *dīpikā*: *daivāt tasyā 'tisāraroḡa utpannaḡ. kubjayā dāsyā praticaritah*, 'through fate he became ill with dysentery, and was cared for(?) by the hunchback slave-woman,

i. e. Devadattā'. Jacobi accordingly took *paḍilaggo* to mean 'sick', but without sufficient reason. Here, as in the other passage in *Erz.* where the word occurs, 27. 29, the etymological meaning must be correct. (*Sak.* 1. 32. 14 has *paḍilagga* as the variant reading of one MS., noted by Pischel as a good one, for *parilagga* of the text. *kuruvaasāhāparilaggam ca me vakkalam*, 'my bark-dress has been caught on the branch of a kuruvaka-tree'.) *prati-caritaḥ*, the commentator's equivalent for *paḍiyario*, is an impossible word in this passage. A derivative of *prati* + *kr* could be used in Sanskrit in the meaning 'treat or cure a disease' and was probably intended by the *dīpikā*. *PSM* p. 634, under *paḍiar* (*prati* + *kr*) gives this meaning but without express reference to this place. If the Prakrit text alone is considered at 31. 31, it is probable that *paḍiyario* is derived from *pari* + *car* as Jacobi took it. Likewise at 1. 5, although Muṇicanda is suffering from hunger and thirst, the general word *pari* + *car*, 'to minister to', seems more in place in the context.

The word *paḍiṭṭhira* is uncertain. *R* 2. 4, *guppanta-paḍiṭṭhira salila-kallōle*, 'the billows of the sea, now agitated, then still'. **pariṣṭhira* does not occur, but is probable, as expressing a high degree of *sthira*, 'fixed, firm'. It is possible, however, that our word represents a contamination of *sthira* and *pratiṣṭhita* (Prakrit *paḍiṭṭhia*) which is synonymous with *sthira*.

R 4. 50, *jattha maham paḍiuttho vasihiṇi añṇassa kaha tahiṇi cia roso*, 'on whom my anger has dwelt, how will another's anger dwell on him?' Here *paḍiuttho* is read by all MSS. except three which read *uṣitaḥ*, *pariuddho*, and *parivuddhaḥ* respectively. The Chāyās read *paryuṣitaḥ*. In the case of this word, either *pari* or *prati* can be combined with the root *vas* to give the required meaning.

Similarly with the word *paḍikamma* which is found in *A* 30. 1 in the meaning 'care of the body, cleansing'. Both *parikarman* and *pratikarman* occur in Sanskrit with this meaning. In this passage the word is found in two compounds, *sapaḍi°* and *appaḍi°*. The doubling of the initial consonant in *appaḍi°* does not necessarily indicate that the Sanskrit equivalent is *prati°*, since in *sapaḍi°* the same Sanskrit simplex is necessary and doubling does not occur. *P* 196 shows that in compounds whether the second member begins with a single or a double consonant is not determined by the fact that the Sanskrit original began with a single

or a double consonant but is quite independent of the Sanskrit facts and inconsistent within Prakrit itself. Here then the word may be either *parikarman* or *pratikarman*.

The adj. 'full' is usually in Sanskrit *paripūrṇa*, in Prakrit *paripunṇa*. In Sanskrit, however, *pratipūrṇa* is found and likewise in Prakrit *paḍipunṇa*, e. g. *R* 5. 19; *Erz* 30. 31, 62. 5; *A* 16; *K* 275. 2, 3.

It is clear from these words that Prakrit *paḍi* does sometimes represent Sanskrit *pari*. Since, however, in the vast majority of cases the normal equivalence is found, even in these words, there can be no question of a phonetic change. Such a phonetic development would be easy, since the sound *r* is classed by the Hindu grammarians as a lingual and exerts a lingualizing influence in phonetic processes (Whitney, *Sanskrit Grammar*, § 52). This phonetic character may have helped to make possible the equivalence. The real explanation must be looked for elsewhere. It may be found in the last three words, i. e., *paḍiuttha*, *paḍikamma*, and *paḍipunṇa*. In these and similar words there were two possibilities. *paḍi*, while it represented a Sanskrit *prati*, could also be taken by the speakers or the writers as representing *pari*, since in the last two cases at least *pari* was more normal. From such cases a process of infection may have started, assisted, in spite of the fact that the semantic spheres of the two prepositions are usually kept distinct in both languages, by the fact that in some words such as *paḍipellana* a secondary meaning is the usual or only one and the etymological force of the preposition is obscured for the users of the language.

PSM lists a number of other *paḍi* words with *pari* as the Sanskrit equivalent. Three such cases are certainly textual corruptions:

paḍittāṇa = *paritrāṇa*, noun, 'rescue'. *Sak* 1. 22. 2. Two of the MSS. read *paḍi*°, the editor following the rest with *pari*° and noting that those two MSS. are corrupt.

paḍivāḍi = *paripātī*, noun, 'row'. *H* vs. 531. *tuha paḍimā-parivāḍim vahaī va saalam disācakkam*, 'the whole heaven contains as it were a row of pictures of you'. The following are the MS. readings: *paḍivāḍim* ψ, *paḍivāḍi* S, *parivāḍim* γRT; *paripātīm*, the Chāyās. The same word occurs also in vs. 571: *kinṇa peccasi jāḍi vāhumūlammī addhaamāḍāṇa parivāḍim*, 'do you not see a row of half-moons on your wife's shoulder?' Here the

readings are: *paḍivāḍim* γψ, *parivāḍim* S, *paripāḍim* T; *paripātīm*, the Chāyās. In both these cases ḍ may be due to preceding or following ḍ.

paḍisaḍaṇa. K, p. 268, line 22. Jacobi's text reads: *niraṃtara-paḍisaḍaṇa-silāṇi u āudalāṇi*. Professor Brown has informed me that on the basis of six MSS., of which the former editor used one only, the correct reading is: *niraṃtara-parisaḍaṇa-silāṇi āuyadalāṇi*, 'the leaves of life are by nature subject to immediate withering'. In *Āśvalāyana Śrautasūtra* 2.6.6, *parisanna* means 'fallen away or by the side' and is to be referred to √*śad*, 'to fall'. Our word may reasonably be connected with this. However P 222 prefers the root *śaṭ* as against Hemacandra's √*śad* and Vararuci's and Kramadīśvara's √*śad*. Three of the MSS. for this passage read *pari*°, and *paḍi*° of the others may well be caused by the following ḍ.

There are other more doubtful cases:

paḍiattana = *parivarttana*, adj., 'alternate'. R 5.69. One MS. *pari*°; the Chāyās *pari*°. *bāṇukkḥita-paḍiattana-ṇisumbhantā lajup-piḍā*, 'die Wassermassen, von dem Pfeil emporgetrieben und bei der Umkehr wieder abwärts geführt'.

paḍiumbana = *paricumbana*, noun, 'embrace'. R 2.27. Two MSS. *pari*°; the Chāyās *pari*°. *ṇāi-sahassa-paḍiumbana-ṇāa-rasaṃ taam*, 'dessen Wasser erkennbar bleibt bei der Umarmung von tausend Flüssen, den ausgedehnten'.

paḍimāsa = *parimarśa*, noun, 'touch'. R 11.91. One MS. *pari*°. One Chāyā reads *pratimarśa*, which Goldschmidt rightly says should be *pari*° since no such meaning is possible in Sanskrit for *pratim*°. In four other passages the text reads *parimāsa*. *miaṇka-kiraṇa-paḍimāsa-maṇḍika-kamalam*, 'with lotuses closed because of the touch of the moon's rays'.

paḍivāḍḍhia = *parivarddhita*, ppl., 'grown', R 5.16. One MS. *pari*°. The Chāyās *pari*°. *thoa-tthoa-paḍivāḍḍhiāmarisa-raso*, 'whose anger swelled gradually'.

Only in the last of these words is there any possible reason for the corruption, namely, the presence of ḍ in the same word. But, since here as in the other three, the preponderance of MS. authority is for *paḍi*°, I am inclined in these cases also to regard Goldschmidt's readings as correct and to see *paḍi* as a substitute for *pari*. It is noteworthy that all four words are substantives where

secondary meanings might lead to the obscuring of the etymological force of the words and so assist the process of infection.

The word *paḍisakkāi* presents difficulties of derivation. There are frequent occurrences of *parisakkāi*, represented in Sanskrit by *pari + kram*, 'to walk around' or by *pari + vṛt*, 'to wander here and there'. The Prakrit root is referred to Sanskrit √*śvaṣk*, but Goldschmidt *R*, p. 188, n. 1, thinks that the Prakrit root is a denominative from Sanskrit *sakta*. In his *Prākṛtica* (Strassburg, 1879), p. 3, he first proposed this derivation. It cannot be considered certain, however, and since *śvaṣk* is a Dhātupāṭha root in Sanskrit, the correct preposition is uncertain. But as the root is almost certainly one denoting motion, we may safely take *pari* as the right one in cases where *parisakk* means 'to wander or walk about'. In two passages *paḍisakk* is found. *B* 35.6, *paḍisakkāi maggē paḍisūrēm*, 'he returns by the opposite road or in the opposite direction'. *R* 7.20, *paḍisakkanti pavaṅgā*, 'the apes go back', with MS. variants *parisappanti* and *parisaṅkrāṃanti*. In both these cases Pischel would emend to *pari*°, as was noticed above, while Goldschmidt in *R* considers *paḍi* correct and equivalent to *pari*. The meaning requires *paḍi* = *prati* if *sakk* is merely a verb of motion, and Pischel's emendation can hardly be considered necessary.

One last instance is *paḍibhamiya* = *paribhramya*, ger., 'wandering about'. *B* 244.10. *paḍibhamiya suhaḍa sīsai dalanti*, 'wandering about the warriors crush their heads'. This is from an Apabhraṃśa text and can hardly be taken as evidence in our present state of knowledge of that dialect. The same must also be said of the first case of *paḍisakkāi* given above.

The evidence then leads to the conclusion that there are some certain cases of the equivalence Prakrit *paḍi* = Sanskrit *pari*, and that, since in three words at least both *prati* and *pari* are possible in Sanskrit with *pari* the more usual, from these words *paḍi* spread to others, especially to substantives where the etymological meaning was not clearly present in the user's consciousness.

TS'UNG SHU

ARTHUR W. HUMMEL

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

THERE is no suitable English word to designate what in China is known as a *ts'ung shu* (叢書).¹ The word *collectanea* comes nearest to the meaning of the Chinese expression, and it is possible that continued usage may ultimately fill it with the content which the Chinese has. The words "anthology" and "thesaurus" have been suggested, but these are yet too restricted in their connotations to include all that a *ts'ung shu* is. The same is true of Alexander Wylie's designation, "collection of reprints"; for a *ts'ung shu* is by no means restricted to articles already printed; it may, and often does contain original articles.

A *ts'ung shu* is, or should be, a collection of reprints on several subjects by several authors. Until seven hundred years ago the Chinese had no *ts'ung shu*. There were so-called "general collections" (總集) of which the *Chao ming wen hsüan* (昭明文選), a collection of poems of the 6th century A. D., is the first representative. But this is not a *ts'ung shu* because the work, although the product of many authors, relates only to a single subject, namely literature.

The first use of the words *ts'ung shu* to designate a collection of writings is in the title of a work of the T'ang dynasty known as the *Li tse ts'ung shu* (笠澤叢書) by Lu Kuei-ming (died about 878 A. D.). This collection is still in existence, and although it bears the name *ts'ung shu*, it does not properly fall within that class, for the reason that it represents the collected writings of only one author. While it was in the T'ang dynasty that the Chinese first created great encyclopedias and similar works of reference, it was in the Sung dynasty that they first had *ts'ung shu*.

Before going into these earliest *ts'ung shu* of the Sung period let us digress for a moment to speak of the purpose and the uses of *ts'ung shu*. When the *ts'ung shu* originated there was, of course, a total absence in China, as in the West, of anything corresponding

¹ For valuable suggestions on *ts'ung shu*, and criticisms of this paper, the author is indebted to Mr. Wen-san Wong and to Dr. Kiang K'ang-hu of the Library of Congress.

to our modern periodical literature in which authors could print short articles, papers, or monographs which in the West now find their way into magazines before they are finally deposited in book form. The *ts'ung shu* was the only medium in which such literature could be preserved. It is true that under this arrangement some things were transmitted which in modern times would never have survived more than one printing, and that other monographs were so hopelessly buried in a mass of miscellaneous titles that they escaped for centuries the notice of ordinary scholars.² But this is due, not to a defect in the concept of the *ts'ung shu*, but to other causes.

Another reason for the rise of *ts'ung shu* is the tremendous loss of literature, especially of monographs too small to circulate independently, in periods of political turmoil and social upheaval. The Sung and Yüan period in which *ts'ung shu* arose was an age in which particularly heavy losses occurred. There are many ancient works whose titles are known but of which, since the Yüan dynasty, the texts have been wholly or partly lost. The *ts'ung shu* offered a sound medium for the preservation of such material.

Finally *ts'ung shu* provided a medium in which collectors and owners of great private libraries could get their rarities published, some dealing perhaps with one particular field of knowledge, but more commonly on a great variety of subjects. It was convenient to give designations to such *ts'ung shu* by prefacing the title with the name of the library where the originals were deposited, or with the owner's studio or fancy name. Such is the *Ching tai mi shu* (津逮藏書) issued by Mao Chin (1598-1650), the owner of the great Chi Ku Ko Library. Mao Chin initiated the practice of libraries publishing *ts'ung shu*, a practice which was followed in the *Chih pu tsu chai t'sung shu* (知不足齋叢書),³ the *Chü chen pan ts'ung shu* (聚珍版叢書)⁴ of the eighteenth century, the *Wen hsüan lou ts'ung shu* (文選樓叢書)⁵, published by Jüan

² For example, the historical investigations of T'sui Shu (1740-1816) were practically lost to China for a century, but could easily have been found, in part at least, in the 畿輔叢書.

³ Containing 197 works, in 240 volumes.

⁴ Containing 148 works, in 800 volumes.

⁵ Containing 53 works, in 112 volumes, of which the originals are now deposited in the Seikado library, Tokyo.

Yüan, and the *Shih wan chüan lou ts'ung shu* (十萬卷樓叢書) of the last century.

While some of the reasons for the rise of *ts'ung shu* are no longer valid, their popularity has in no way diminished. They are still being produced in increasing numbers by retired scholars like Lo Chen-yü, and others who have the time and the means to devote to it. Lou Chin of Tientsin published in 1923 the *Hu pei hsien cheng i shu* (湖北先正遺書)⁶ at a cost of \$40,000 Chinese currency. The *ts'ung shu* has come to be a miniature library—a Chinese “five foot shelf” of well-selected works—serving as a means to a liberal education. Such, for example, is the *Wan yü wen k'u* (萬有文庫),⁷ published by the Commercial Press in 1928. Already five thousand sets of this “Home University Library” have been sold, mostly to district officials as the nucleus of public libraries. It is intended to expand this collection to ten thousand volumes to include most of the great eighteenth-century manuscript library known as the *Ssu k'u ch'üan shu*.

Nor has the *ts'ung shu* lost its original characteristic as a depository of rare materials. A *ts'ung shu* like the *Ssu pu ts'ung k'an* (四部叢刊),⁸ published by the Commercial Press in 1922, reproduces photographically reprints of rare Sung, Yüan, and Ming editions for the use of scholars who have no access to, and cannot themselves afford to collect, the best recensions of ancient texts. Lo Chen-yü's *Hsüeh t'ang ts'ung k'an* (雪堂叢刻) is a good modern example of a *ts'ung shu* designed to preserve newly recovered fragments of ancient writings. In this field the great eighteenth century historical critics led the way. Good examples of their industry are Sun Hsing-yen's *P'ing ching kuan t'sung shu* (平津館叢書) and Ma Kuo-han's *Yü han shan fang chi shih shu* (玉函山房輯佚書), the latter containing 632 reprints of rediscovered works.

Ts'ung shu which relate to one class of subjects such as geography, history, philosophy, etc., have become very popular in recent years. These serve the needs of the specialist who desires selected readings on a particular subject. And in the absence of adequate library facilities they serve the function of a *subject bibliography*,

⁶ Containing 75 works, in 180 volumes.

⁷ Now comprising 1110 works, in 2010 volumes.

⁸ Containing 323 works, in 2100 volumes.

or, as in the case of such a geographical work as the *Chi fu ts'ung shu* (畿輔叢書), a regional bibliography of no small importance.

Until a few years ago the *Po ch'üan hsüeh hai* (百川學海), compiled by Tso Kuei in 1273 A. D., was commonly regarded as the ancestor of all Chinese *ts'ung shu*. But since the publication in 1924 of T'ao Hsiang's edition of the *Ju hsüeh ching wu* (儒學警悟), it is evident that this latter work, compiled by Yü Ching, in 1201 (seventy-two years earlier than the *Po ch'üan hsüeh hai*), is the true ancestor of Chinese *ts'ung shu*. It was lost to the world as an independent collection until in 1892 a complete Ming manuscript copy, discovered in Shansi province, fell into the hands of Miao Ch'üan-sun, the noted bibliophile and member of the Historiographical Board. It is true that all but one of the seven monographs which this *ts'ung shu* contains had been copied into the Imperial Library,⁹ but the existence of the first item in the collection—the *Shih lin yen yü pien* (右林燕語辨), by Wang Ying-chen of the twelfth century—was actually not known to exist until the *ts'ung shu* itself had been recovered. Thus a monograph that was lost to the world for seven centuries was recovered in a lone Ming copy, an example of the kind of recovery of ancient documents that was so common in the eighteenth century, and is now so characteristic a feature of the present cultural renaissance.

Two other works of the Sung period may be mentioned as approaching very near to *ts'ung shu*, the *Kan chu chi* (甘珠集), compiled by Chu Sheng-fei shortly after 1100 A. D., and the *Lei shuo* (類說), compiled by Tseng Tsao in 1146 A. D. The former is a collection of stories drawn from one hundred and thirty-seven different works arranged for purposes of literary composition; the latter is a collection of six hundred and twenty episodes also drawn from ancient literature. But neither of these works reprint in full (including prefaces and postfaces) the materials from which they draw, and for that reason fall short of being true *ts'ung shu*.

The second oldest *ts'ung shu*, the *Po ch'üan hsüeh hai*, comprising, as the title indicates, one hundred different monographs, has recently been reproduced in facsimile from the thirteenth century original recovered from various private libraries. No complete

⁹ Ssu k'u ch'üan shu (四庫全書).

Sung edition is still in existence, but all except nine of the hundred items were found in an original Sung edition recovered from the imperial country seat at P'an Shan near the Eastern Tombs outside of Peking. Another eight items were found in a facsimile reprint made from a Sung original in 1501; and the hundredth or last item necessary to complete the whole series was copied from the library of Li Chiao-wei of Te-hua, Fukien. The result is that this second oldest *ts'ung shu* compiled in 1273, can now be had with all the original one hundred monographs, in a facsimile reprint of the original edition of nearly seven hundred years ago.

If we accept as *ts'ung shu* all works which by their titles claim to be such we can divide them into the following five classes:

I. *Works Arranged from the Standpoint of Authorship.*

- (a) Works by one author; as, for example, the Collected Writings of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, *Yin ping shih wen chi* (飲冰室文集).
- (b) Works by One Family such as the Collected Writings of the Family of Su Tung-p'o, *San su ch'üan chi* (三蘇全集).
- (c) Works by Several Authors on One Subject, e. g., the Collected Writings of certain T'ang and Sung Poets, *T'ang sung pa ta chia wen ch'ao* (唐宋八大家文鈔).
- (d) Works by Several Authors on Several Subjects, that is to say, genuine *ts'ung shu* such as the *Po ch'üan hsüeh hai* mentioned above.

II. *Works Arranged from the Standpoint of Contents.*

- (a) Classics, *Huang ch'ing ching chieh* (皇清經解).
- (b) History (Twenty-four Dynastic Histories).
- (c) Geography, *Hsiao fang hu chai yü ti ts'ung ch'ao* (小方壺輿地叢鈔).
- (d) Fiction, e. g., the *Shu fu* (說郛); a fourteenth century *ts'ung shu* incorporating 1681 short stories, bound in 160 volumes.

III. *Works Arranged from the Standpoint of Locality.*

Like the *Chi fu ts'ung shu* (畿輔叢書), containing works written by natives of Chihli province from ancient to mod-

ern times. There are similar works for Kiangsi, Hupei, Chekiang, Hunan, Kuangtung, Yünnan and other provinces.

IV. *Works Arranged According to Periods of Time.*

Like the *Han wei ts'ung shu* (漢魏叢書) and the *T'ang sung ts'ung shu* (唐宋叢書), both of the Ming period, and both incorporating only the rare works of certain dynasties.

V. *Ts'ung Shu Issued by Schools or Societies.*

E. g., Peking University Ts'ung Shu, South-Eastern University Ts'ung Shu, Chinese Library Association Ts'ung Shu, etc.

But for library classification not all works which are called *ts'ung shu* can be placed in that class; it is necessary to set up a criterion that will enable the librarian to differentiate between true *ts'ung shu* and quasi-*ts'ung shu*. The collected works of one author, such as the writings of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao, even though they are on many different subjects, cannot properly be called *ts'ung shu*. Such works must be classed under *chi*, that is to say, complete works of individual authors. In the same way, works on one subject, or works limited to a particular field of knowledge like the *Hsiao fang hu chai yü ti ts'ung ch'ao*, even though it contains the writings of hundreds of authors, should be classed as a work on geography rather than a *ts'ung shu*. If we wish to retain the name *ts'ung shu* to cover such works, they should be called "class *ts'ung shu*" or "subject *ts'ung shu*"; the words *ts'ung shu* being retained to cover only general collections on different subjects by several authors. Such are the *Chü chen pan ts'ung shu* (聚珍版叢書), comprising 148 rare works copied from the Palace Library in 1773 and published in 800 volumes; and the *Kuang ya ts'ung shu* (廣雅叢書), comprising 167 works in 560 volumes.

While the *Hsiao fang hu chai yü ti ts'ung ch'ao* is really a class *ts'ung shu* (being a work devoted exclusively to geography), it is a noteworthy example of the manner in which not a few *ts'ung shu* have come to be. Wang Hsi-ch'i, the compiler, believing, as he states in his preface, that much of the weakness which China exhibited at the close of the last century was due to an inadequate

knowledge of both Chinese and world geography, set to work to compile a geographical *ts'ung shu* to remedy this situation. The original preface is dated 1877, which is the time he began collecting travel diaries and geographical treatises of every kind, but the first edition did not appear until 1891, and even then the expense of printing burdened him with a debt which impoverished him for the rest of his life. Not deterred, however, he published, with the help of friends, an extensive supplement in 1894, and another in 1897. He continued in these efforts up to the time of his death, but was reduced to such poverty that in the end he had to depend solely on the bounty of relatives and friends. It is not too much to say that he literally saved to posterity hundreds of valuable monographs which but for his enthusiasm would certainly have perished. The magnitude of his labor can be imagined when we reflect that the *Hsiao fang hu chai yü ti ts'ung ch'ao* actually contains 1413 different works, an imperishable collection of selected readings in the field of Chinese geography.

BRIEF NOTE.

The Old Indian vīṇā

When preparing my notes on the "Parts of a vīṇā" (*JAOS* 50. 244-253), I had not seen Canon Gilpin's learned discussion of Sumerian harps in *Music and Letters* for April, 1929. In the course of this article it is pointed out that in "nearly all oriental harps there is no front pillar," and that one of the Sumerian harps found by Mr. Woolley at Ur was a bow-shaped harp of this kind. This Sumerian harp had nails or pins on the arm which served as "guides for the strings which were wound round them and the neck to the tension required." The Burmese harp (*sauṇ*) has no such guides, but its tuning "is dependent solely on hand tension or on the raising of the string on the sloping neck." It is to be inferred that the old Indian harp *vīṇā* was similarly tuned by adjustment of the strings on the neck; and perhaps the word *aṅgulinigraha* should be understood as referring to pins on the neck similar to those of the old Sumerian harp.

Canon Gilpin then laments the current neglect of the comparative historical and ethnographical study of musical instruments and himself outlines the distribution of the bow-shaped and other kinds of harp. In discussing the Indian form he falls into numerous errors. "The bow-shaped harp," he says, "is not a musical instrument or India" (I am not quite sure what this is intended to mean); "Hindustani music has no knowledge of it and it is stated that even Sanskrit treatises have no description of it" (but what else is referred to in the *Nāṭya Śāstra*?) "if they had, it would probably be classed, like other foreign (!) instruments, as a *Vina*, which it certainly is not."

Canon Gilpin is however aware that bow-shaped harps are represented at Sāñcī (where he antedates the reliefs by 150 years) and at Amravati (*sic*) "but here sculptures are not in the style and art of India," and mainly because Hsüan Tsang in the seventh century A. D. speaks of "them" (actually, he did not visit Sāñcī, and it is not certain that he saw Amarāvātī) as "ornamented with all the art of the palaces of Bactria," he calls the Indian bow-shaped harp "the Bactrian harp" without more ado. Students of the

history of musical instruments who are not Indianists should be warned against the adoption of this term.

In the first place, we know practically nothing about Bactrian art in the third century B. C. (as remarked by Rostovtzeff, "we know so little of Bactrian art that it is mistake to explain *ignotum per ignotius*"), and certainly have no representations of bow-shaped harps which could be adduced as possible prototypes of the Indian forms: moreover, the Sāsānian harp, which presumably preserves an older Irānian type, is not bow-shaped but has a post. No evidence is brought forward for the implied view that the *vīṇā* constantly referred to in Vedic, Sanskrit, and Pali literature is anything but the bow-shaped harp of the monuments. Again, the art of Bharhut, Sāñcī, and Amarāvati is in fact essentially Indian—no one, for example, would suggest a foreign source for the architectural forms or the costumes, and it is a gratuitous complication to make a special case of the harp. What the reliefs show is not the imposition of a new culture on a clean slate, but simply a traditional culture pictorially recorded for the first time in permanent materials. Archaeological evidence, too, is every day establishing more and more clearly the continuity of pre-Maurya and post-Maurya civilization. The fact of Indo-Sumerian relationships established by the Sind valley excavations is quite familiar; and the occurrence of the bow-shaped harp in early Sumerian and surviving in Śuṅga Indian merely adds one more to the long list of cognate forms and types which equally in India and Mesopotamia derive from a common cultural source. Any theory of borrowing of particular forms at a later period has to be supported by individual and specific proofs. I therefore still maintain that the Indian bow-shaped harp is the *vīṇā* of the early literature, and see no reason to suppose that it was introduced into India precisely in the first quarter of the second century B. C.

There is nothing mysterious about the presence of a bow-shaped harp in India. A more interesting and more difficult problem is presented by the fact that some time not long after the Gupta period a *vīṇā* of the modern type with a gourd or gourds replaced the earlier harp. What was the source of the modern form? Why was it preferred? How far do the Sanskrit treatises on music have in view the earlier, and how far the later kind of *vīṇā*?

It may be added that a very clear representation of a woman (*yakṣī*) playing the harp-*vīṇā* is reproduced on Pl. VI of T. N.

Ramachandran, *Buddhist sculptures from a stupa nr. Goli Village, Guntur District*, Madras, 1929. Here the strings are struck by the fingers of the left hand only, without a plectrum. The rings on the neck of the *vinā* seem to indicate something more than a mere attachment of the strings, and perhaps some kind of tuning device is intended; at any rate, the forefinger is very definitely pressed down at one of the attachment points, as if to control the tone.

In Jātaka IV, 470, a girl plays on a *vinā* with her fingernails (*agganakhehi*) and sings, confirming the evidence of some of the reliefs, where no plectrum is shown.

I have received some valuable comments from Mr. J. Kunst, the well known scholar of Indonesian music, who has just been appointed to take charge of musical archaeological researches in Java. In this author's *Hindoe-javaansche Muziek-instrumenten*, 1927, p. 15, it is pointed out that the old Egyptian bow-harp was called *bjn.t* or *bin*, which becomes *vini* in Koptic; and that the evident connection with Sanskrit *vinā* indicates either a common source (as would appear to me likely) or a later borrowing from Egypt (surely improbable inasmuch as the word *vinā* is already current in Vedic texts). Mr. Kunst here assumes also that as in Java, so also in India proper, the word *vinā* actually denoted a bow harp. In either case, we have to do with a non-Aryan loan word in Sanskrit. For other data I quote Mr. Kunst's letter to me, dated November 28, 1930:

"The oldest illustration, I know, of the *modern* vina, you will find on one of the reliefs of the Bayon-temple of Angkor Thom, viz. on one of the interior galleries, East front, North wing (see Dufour, *Le Bayon d'Angkor Thom*, pl. 120).

"The 'mandolin'—better lute—you have found on the Amara-vati-reliefs, appears, as you know, in many specimens and varieties on Barabudur. Further one specimen on the Shiva-temple at Prambanan (first basement, balustrade, South No. a), one in the hands of a bronze statuette of Sarasvati (Heine-Geldern, *Altjavanische Bronzen*, Tafel 14), and in those of two terracotta statuettes, found among the ruins of Madjapahit. (The latter two are slightly different and probably have undergone respectively younger North Chinese and Arabian influences.)

"The old Indian harp may have died in India proper rather early, but it has survived on Java, at least till the eleventh century.

It occurs three times on Barabudur (resp. on relief Ia 1, Ia 52, and II 1), once on the Djalatunda-reliefs from A. D. 977, and once among the Ngandjoek-statuettes (in the hands of Sarasvati again, tenth century). On the continent it survived at least till the twelfth century, as it appears on the Angkor Thom relief, already mentioned.

"Today not only in Burma this small 'boogharp' is to be found but also in Siam, where it is still called *p'hin*.

"The word *danda* occurs also in the old Javanese redaction (from A. D. 996) of the *Wirataparwa* (53), where it is combined with the word *pangupit* (something, that 'pinches'?).

"The use of a plectrum is also shown on Barabudur—at least for the playing of the lute. See, for instance, reliefs O 102 and Ia 52.

"There are three different methods of tending and tuning the strings of those 'boogharpjes.' The first—and most primitive—is that of the harps from India proper, Turkestan, Further India and of two of the three Barabudur harps. It is done by means of chords.

"The second method is that by means of 'plugs,' wooden pins, to which the strings are fastened. This was the method of the old Egyptian and probably that of the other Barabudur, the Djalatunda, and the Ngandjoek harps.

"Those plugs make it possible to count the number of strings. The Djalatunda-harp has four, the Ngandjoek specimen seven (like the old Indian harps), and that of Barabudur ten strings.


"The third method, by means of real screws, is the most efficient. It is applied to some of the modern Negro harps (Uganda, Bakuba, Ubangi [Azandé, Mangbetu], Mandingo, Togo, Fan).

"The old Burmese lutes had three strings (see Courant, *Essai historique sur la musique des Chinois*, p. 177), so had most of the Barabudur lutes (for instance, reliefs O 125, II 1, and II 128), and the one of Prambanan. The rest of the Barabudur lutes have—seldom—two strings (relief O 102) or four strings (relief O 151). Instruments with five strings I do not know from Java."

The accompanying reproduction of the Pawāyā dancing scene shows both the lute and the harp-vīṇā very clearly.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.



Dancing scene showing the lute and the harp-*vīṇā*.

From an architrave at Pawāyā, Gwalior.

(Photograph by the Archaeological Department, Gwalior State.)

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

The Āryabhaṭīya of Āryabhaṭa, An Ancient Indian Work on Mathematics and Astronomy. Translated with notes by WALTER EUGENE CLARK, Professor of Sanskrit in Harvard University. Chicago: UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS, 1930. Pp. xxx + 90. \$2.50.

Āryabhaṭa's work, which was composed in 499 A. D., as dated in (III, 10) is probably the oldest preserved text from the third or scientific period of Indian astronomy, and is the earliest preserved Indian mathematical text.

Professor Clark publishes his material modestly as a first study of the complete text of four sections in 126 stanzas. It is a descriptive summary rather than a full working manual as in later texts. Ten of the first 13 stanzas give in a very condensed form the numerical elements similar to ours of Āryabhaṭa's epicyclic astronomy. The other stanzas are introductory, explanatory of the notation and finally a colophon evincing knowledge of place value. The second section of 33 stanzas on mathematics had been previously translated by Rodet (1879) and Kaye (1908). A third section of 25 stanzas deals with the reckoning of time, and the last 50 stanzas are called the sphere. The translation by Prabodh Chandra Sengupta, reprinted from the Calcutta University's *Journal of the Department of Letters*, appeared as Clark went to press.

In (I. 1) the number of the revolutions of the moon is expressed by a word the syllables of which give in reverse order the digits of 57,753,336, and Clark says it is hard to believe that such a notation was not based on place value. Kaye gives a somewhat similar notation for 4,320,000 the number of revolutions of the sun. It is to be noted that this number is one-third of 60^4 shown by H. V. Hilprecht, Vol. XX, to be at the basis of Babylonian calculations, and it is to be remembered that E. Hincks, in 1854, found tablets of date some thousands of years before Āryabhaṭa showing a place system; also, the American Mayas used local value and a true zero in the first century A. D. (Cajori, *A History of Mathematical Notation*, 1928.) Archimedes had periods of eight figures for the tremendous numbers in the "sand reckoner" and the "cattle problem."

(T. L. Heath, *Archimedes*.) English merchants were reckoning on the line at about the time of the American Revolution and it took more than two centuries after the Hindu Arabic numerals were well known in Europe to displace the Roman system, cumbersome but still possible to one who could count to five. Charles Dickens made a striking remark when he said in *Bleak House*, "a certain man was to his wife what zero is to 9 and 90." The place system of the Babylonians was probably communicated to other peoples but fell on fertile soil only among the Hindus. (See also J. Gow, *History of Greek Mathematics*.)

Clark has been the principal defender outside of India against the debunking argument of the late G. R. Kaye, Carra de Vaux, and Nicol Bubnov in favor of the Neo-Platonists. None of these authors seems to recognize that algebra, which is distinctly Hindu, in contrast to the geometric Greek mind, uses the principle of local value. Compare $3x^2 + 6x + 5$, and 365, and note Kaye and Clark were nearer together than they realized, in the curious square and cube root processes of Āryabhaṭa.

Most interesting and surprising are (IV, 9) "as a man in a boat going forward sees a stationary object moving backward, just so at Lāṅkā a man sees the stationary asterisms moving backward," and also in (IV, 12) last sentence, "the gods and dwellers in hell both think constantly that the others are beneath them." This appreciation of relativity reconciles Āryabhaṭa's position on the stationary earth for which he has been criticized by other Hindu writers. Also he gave $\pi = 3.1416$, a closer approximation than he used. The errors of the volume of the pyramid and sphere are probably due to a copyist. Possibly the latter should read $\left(\frac{16}{9} R\right)^2 \sqrt{\frac{16}{9}} R = \frac{4}{3} R$ times the area of a circle. The problems in indeterminate linear equations $ax \pm by = c$, etc. quite likely use Euclid's highest common factor algorithm known as the pulverizer but the algebra is much more general than any Greek influence gives, in fact it finally leads up to contributions to Number Theory which have often been said to be more important than any before LaGrange.

Mr. Clark's comments on the Hindu astronomy, its tables and formulas, are adequate and the conception of right ascension in early Hindu astronomy seems to be new.

University of Pennsylvania.

M. J. BABB.

The Mīmāṃsā Nyāya Prakāśa or Āpadevī: A Treatise on the Mīmāṃsā System by Āpadeva. Translated into English, with an Introduction, Transliterated Sanskrit Text, and Glossarial Index, by FRANKLIN EDGERTON. New Haven: YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1929. Pp. ix + 308. \$4.

Less consideration has been given to the Mīmāṃsā by western scholars than to any other of the six classical systems of Indian philosophy. The Mīmāṃsā does pay some attention to the problem of knowledge, to God (although its position in general is atheistic), the soul, the world, and salvation, but its main interest is with the sacrifice, and its whole doctrine of salvation is dependent upon the performance of ritual acts rather than upon knowledge, devotion, or the formation of personal character. Moreover, the texts are difficult, diffuse, abstruse, technical, and lacking in literary grace. Further, the system is based upon a civilization which is now only of historical interest. The main part of its doctrine can never be revived and made to play an important role in the present or future. The old Vedic sacrificial system belongs to an extinct civilization, even though in small groups its study and partial practice may have continued down to the present. The system makes less religious and philosophical appeal to the needs of the present than any of the other systems.

As Edgerton emphasizes repeatedly it contains much that is interesting from the point of view of linguistics. Its firm conviction that the word (the Veda) is eternal and that man's duty is absolutely dependent upon Vedic injunctions led inevitably to an elaborate analysis of sentences, words, and sounds, and the forces behind them or engendered by them.

The Āpadevī is not one of the old classical commentaries on the Mīmāṃsā Sūtras themselves. These are very diffuse and unwieldy and chaotic in their elaboration of arguments and counter-arguments. In a sense, as being a brief, well-knit summary, it bears the same relation to the old commentaries that the Sūtras do to the Brāhmaṇas of the Veda. It is a condensed summary made in the seventeenth century and has been widely used in India since that date as an introduction to the principles of the system.

A correct text is given in transliteration, based on the Nirṇaya-sāgara and Chowkhamba editions with some reference to an edi-

tion printed in the *Pandit*. The text has been divided into short paragraphs which are numbered. Headings have been inserted to indicate the topics under which groups of paragraphs fall.

The translation is an admirable one. The notes are brief, but of great value for the understanding of difficult points in the text.

The introduction, in addition to dealing with the author and discussing his sources (with an identification of most of the quotations from Vedic texts), gives a careful summary of the text which will serve as a general introduction to the essentials of Mīmāṃsā.

Appended is a very useful glossarial index of technical Sanskrit words, an index of quotations, and an English index which refers the words back to the Sanskrit index.

It is a difficult text. The reviewer does not possess such technical knowledge of the system as would warrant criticism of abstruse details of translation and interpretation, but so far as he can judge the translation is remarkably clear and faithful.

The book is a good introduction to Mīmāṃsā style and thought, and a convenient book of reference for the understanding of Mīmāṃsā technical terms which are constantly met with in other texts. The elaborate rules of ritual interpretation developed by the Mīmāṃsā around its exegesis of the Vedic ritualistic texts, and the principles implied by them, have been widely extended, especially into the domain of law. Its technical terms are widely employed outside the system itself. It is of great importance for the proper understanding of the whole civilization of ancient India before the elaborate ritual of Brahmanism had been replaced by the temple worship and *pūjā* of Hinduism.

WALTER EUGENE CLARK.

Harvard University.

La sculpture de Mathurā. By J. PH. VOGEL. *Ars Asiatica*, Vol. XV. Paris and Brussels: VAN OEST, 1930. Pp. 131, with 60 collotype plates.

A complete knowledge of the sculpture of the Mathurā (modern Muttra) school of sculpture, from the Śuṅga to the Gupta period inclusive, a span of some seven hundred and fifty years, would by itself suffice to establish the history of Indian art and iconography on a firm basis. Unfortunately, the earlier excavations were con-

ducted in a fashion little calculated to preserve scientific data, much of the material still lies buried and inaccessible beneath modern structures; the great collections in the Mathurā museum are crowded and chaotically arranged; many important examples are to be found in other Indian museums, especially Lucknow and Calcutta, and some are in Europe and America (three now in Boston are now illustrated); and Dr. Vogel's own invaluable, though insufficiently illustrated, catalogue of the Mathurā museum is out of print. The present highly meritorious and very welcome volume, while it illustrates on an adequate scale a majority of the most remarkable pieces and thus for the most part ones already well known, is rather a general introduction to the subject than an exhaustive treatment of it. What we really need in addition to this is an actual corpus of Mathurā sculpture, illustrating almost every known fragment; and though this would require perhaps ten volumes of the present size, one can hardly doubt that such a corpus will one day be compiled, or that further and more systematic excavation will be undertaken.

The group of sculptures selected for illustration shows perhaps a greater qualitative variation than has been generally recognized; but the abundance of dated inscriptions is of great assistance (most of these have reference to years past since the accession of the greatest of the Kuṣāna kings, Kaniṣka, and there is a difference of opinion amongst scholars as to whether this took place in A. D. 78, or in A. D. 129). It does not seem necessary to have renounced altogether the recognition of stylistic sequence; Bachhofer, in his *Early Indian Sculpture* very clearly and profitably established such a sequence in the case of the Buddha figures; ultimately it will be possible to arrive at fairly close datings by a combination of epigraphic and aesthetic evidence with that to be derived from an exact study of the costumes, such as no one has yet undertaken. This study of costume, particularly of the headdresses and jewellery will at the same time go far to clarify the true relationships between the Kuṣāna and Graeco-Buddhist schools; it will be found, for example, that none of the Gandhāran Bodhisattvas wears a turban antedating the fully developed Kuṣāna type.

Dr. Vogel, in his Preface, also renounces aesthetic judgments, as being too much affected by subjective and preconceived ideas. Still, he does not hesitate to speak of the mediocrity of the majority

of works of the Kuṣāna period, or to call the earliest Mathurā Buddha types such as Friar Bala's monumental "Bodhisattva" (Pl. XXVIII, a) heavy and coarse, and impressive only by their bulk! It is quite true that sharp differences of opinion are met with on a point like this; but it is not impossible to recognize and allow for the causes of these differences, and it is my belief that sound aesthetic judgments can and must be made by the historian of art or museum curator. But such judgments should affect the selection of one's material, rather than bulk largely in the description of it. Hence I am very far from regretting the fact that Dr. Vogel's book is primarily an iconography of Mathurā sculpture, and not an "appreciation" of it. As iconography it deals very largely with material already published by the author elsewhere, and brings together very conveniently what has not hitherto been readily accessible; it provides at the same time fresh evidence of the author's great learning and competence. Perhaps the most interesting novelty is a strange image of Indra surrounded by Nāgas (Pl. XXXIX), evidently a counterpart of the already well-known but still enigmatic "Queen of the Nāgas" (Pl. XL). There is an original and valuable discussion of the type of vase-bearing pedestals, which include the so-called Bacchanalian groups (really Yakṣa groups) of earlier authors; Dr. Vogel is clearly right in emphasizing their Buddhist application, but I should be much more inclined to see in them *ācamana-kumbhīs* (water vessels for the use of visitors to a shrine) than *piṇḍa-pātras* (votive begging bowls for the reception of offerings). In the section dealing with Jātaka scenes it is overlooked that the lunette scene of J 2 in the Mathurā museum (Pl. XVII, b) has been recognized as a scene from the Mahābodhi Jātaka; while the reference to the Kacchapa Jātaka at Bodh-Gayā is incorrect to the extent that the representation occurs not on one of the pillars of the "vielle balustrade" dateable about 100 B. C., but on one of the late Gupta pillars dateable about the sixth century A. D. In connection with the account of Garuḍas, attention may be called to the discussion in the *Catalogue of the Indian Collections, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*, Pt. VI, p. 91; and it may be added that *Dhammapada Atthakathā* I. 164 proves that the strange type of the roc able to carry off and devour five elephants was already known at a comparatively early date. I cannot agree with Dr. Vogel as to the nature of the motif

of the garland borne by Yakṣas (pp. 79-81); this garland is really a lotus rhizome; this has already been pointed out, and the full evidence will appear in my *Yakṣas*, Pt. II, now in the press; and it is quite possible that the motif as found at Alexandria, for example, is really of Indian origin, and not vice-versa. As to the *kinnara* (p. 76) it is quite true that the name is almost always restricted to a creature half-human, half-bird; still, in the *Kādambarī*, 241, they are plainly described as "monsters with horses' heads," and such monsters in later paintings are sometimes represented as musicians, which suggests that they are meant to be *kinnaras*. More usually the creature with a human body and horse head (Pali *assamukhī*, etc.) is a Yakṣī. The identification of the Jātaka of Pl. XVI, a, is welcome, but a reference on p. 63 to the Chinese source would be in place. On Pl. XXVI, c, the worshipping figure to the right is Indra. On p. 36 it does not seem to me justifiable to use the term *uṣṇīṣa* for the spiral lock on Buddha heads of the Indian type. As to Avalokiteśvara (p. 43), B 82 in the Lucknow Museum, fig. 78 of my *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, shows a seated Buddha in the headdress, and an amṛta flask in the hand, combining features usually characteristic respectively of Avalokiteśvara and of Maitreya. It is pertinent to the problem of crowned Buddhas (cf. the recent able discussion by M. Mus, *BÉFEO*, 28) that in Indra's visit scenes of type of Pl. LI, b, the Buddha's turban (the replacement of turban by crown as royal headdress belongs to a later time) which was translated to the heaven of Indra, is always placed directly and significantly immediately above the Buddha's head, and this probably leads to the later Gandhāran and Gupta (at Kārli) coronation types. It might be legitimate to identify the Yakṣas of Pl. XLV, d and e, as Moggarapāṇi. It is hard to see why the structure surrounding a Bodhi-tree, seen on Pl. XIV, a, is not described as a *bodhi-ghara*, but only called a "curious little building." It seems to me that the subject of the Yakṣas might have been treated at somewhat greater length; their history certainly began long before the data available in Buddhist literature; and it cannot be doubted that many, if not most, of the *śālabhañjikā* (we have to thank Dr. Vogel for the correct identification of this architectural term) are really Yakṣīs, and not mere women. In the present selection one would like to have seen included the fine early Buddha relief of the

Ethnographische Museum, Leiden, recently published by Scherman; and the well preserved Śuṅga fragments, I 15 and I 18 in the Mathurā Museum, for which however, Bachhofer's *Early Indian sculpture*, Pls. 71 and 82 may be consulted. The foregoing minor criticisms in no way detract from the consistent excellence of the whole work; the press-work and reproductions are admirable, and misprints have not been detected.

Early Indian Sculpture. By LUDWIG BACHHOFER. 2 vols., pp. xlv + 137 and 161 collotype plates. New York: PEGASUS PRESS (HARCOURT, BRACE AND Co.), 1929. \$60.00.

This study of stylistic development will be valuable, and indeed indispensable, to students of Indian archaeology, equally on account of the text and of the fine illustrations; if the latter bring forward very little that is new, they nevertheless render accessible a great mass of essential documents now available only in rare and out of print works. The author not only discusses with great care the dating and aesthetic relations of the principal monuments, but more than once contributes passages of fine aesthetic appreciation, particularly when he discusses the art of the "golden age"; this is, in his view, from 50 B. C. to 70 A. D., though I cannot understand his depreciation of the art of Amarāvātī, ca. 200 A. D.

Neglect of the pre-Maurya period, for which indeed our data are scanty but definite conclusions certainly warranted, leads to a too great emphasis on contemporary Persian influence in the time of Aśoka; what we ought actually to recognize in early Indian art forms are not contemporary borrowings from, but the Indian cognates of Western Persian types. The "bell capital", for example, is altogether too much *unlike* the Persepolitan form to be a direct loan, while on the other hand the morphology is clearly and readily explainable from Indian Vedic sources (cable moulding = stamens, abacus = pericarp, the whole bell capital = *padma-piṭha*, "the lotus means the waters"—ŚBr., vii. 4. 1. 8).¹

The term *rūpa-bheda* (for which we have authority actually only

¹ See my note on this subject in the *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. VI, p. 373.

as late as the 12th century A.D.), here introduced in connection with the earliest sculpture, is misunderstood; it means the "distinguishing of ideal types" (cf. *nāyaka-bheda* and similar collocations), in other words "iconography", and certainly not the separation of the parts of a single figure.

The most important archaeological contribution is the study of the dating of the various types of the Mathurā Buddha figure, beginning with Friar Bala's image of the third year of Kaniṣka (i. e., A. D. 81 in Bachhofer's reckoning, which is adhered to in this notice). Up to A. D. 127 the Mathurā Buddha shows no trace whatever of Gandharan influence in style or iconography; then from A. D. 129 to 142 effects of Gandharan influence are traceable, mainly in the changed treatment of the drapery, in the placing of figure reliefs on the pedestals, and a change in pose of the pedestal lions; there follows a return to purely Indian types, but now with curly hair in place of the single spiral lock of the original type. These data seem to be irrefutably established. But the Gandhara Buddha type, is still dated back to or before the beginning of the Christian era, giving us the extraordinary phenomenon of an entire absence of contact between the two schools during a century; and this leaves something to be explained—in my own view by a later dating of the Gandharan type.

The iconographical descriptions of the plates leave something to be desired in fullness and accuracy (see my longer notice to appear in *Rūpam*); and misprints are all too frequent, some errors such as Jātaka being constantly repeated. More astonishing is the fact that no mention is made of the Guḍimallam lingam; and that the author should only have "come across" Codrington's *Ancient India* and my *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, published respectively three and two years before the date of his own book, too late to do more than record the fact. The phraseology "hedge" and "jamb" for the usual "railing" and "railing-pillar", and "beam" and "roof-beam" for "coping" is unfortunate. But on the whole the book marks a very real advance in method; the stylistic problems are now discussed seriously, in a language intelligible to the student of the general history of art, and not, as for example in the late Vincent Smith's *History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*, merely naively.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY.

Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Mesopotamian Origins. The Basic Population of the Near East.

By EPHRAIM A. SPEISER. Philadelphia: UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS, 1930. Pp. xiii + 198.

In 1918 R. Campbell Thompson discovered a stratum of painted pottery, similar to Elamite ware from Susa and Musyân, below the oldest historical level of Eridu, in southern Babylonia. He advanced the view, which has steadily gained ground, that the "painted pottery culture," as it has since been called, was pre-Sumerian, a theory which agrees with the growing tendency to consider the Sumerians as immigrants from the east in late pre-historic times. In 1923 Arthur Ungnad suggested, with reservations, that the Subaraeans (a name which he adapted from Accadian *Subarû*, "a man from northern Mesopotamia") be regarded as the autochthonous population, not only of the highlands east, north, and west of Babylonia, but also of that land itself. Three years later Professor Speiser began the study of the Nuzian tablets discovered by Chiera in 1925, and was led to stress the great importance of the Hurrians (a term equivalent to Subaraeans, but with a more general, as well as a better documented meaning). After conducting excavations in the chalcolithic mound of Tepe Gaura, in Assyria, he adopted his present view, which represents a generalization and combination of the theories of Thompson and Ungnad.

Speiser's book at once takes its place as the best book on the subject, as a treatment which combines wide and critical learning with a precise, first-hand knowledge of both the linguistic and the archaeological phases of the problem.

The first chapter, entitled "The Background," gives a general survey of the linguistic material bearing on the Caucasian family of languages, with full bibliographical data in the notes. In passing we may observe that the elaborate footnotes are a most valuable feature of the book. The sketch is admirable, and the characterization of the work of the many scholars who have treated different phases of the subject, from Kretschmer to Marr and Trombetti, is excellent. A rapid survey of the anthropological and archaeological material is also given in the same chapter. The reader should correct the misprint "hypo-brachycephalic" (pp. 10-11) for "hyper-brachycephalic." It may be doubted whether Marr's term

"Japhethite," which Speiser restricts to "Caucasian" and guards against ethnological misuse, is happy, since the majority of the peoples listed in Gen. X under this head spoke Indo-European languages in the age when that chapter was written. In fact, it cannot be proved that a single one of these peoples spoke any other language at that time. However, this is purely a question of personal preference.

In the second chapter Speiser treats "Elam and Sumer in the Epigraphical Sources." Here the *pièce de resistance*, following a very good discussion of the material at our disposal, consists of a careful study of the oldest Babylonian place-names. The most common endings of these place-names, such as *-ak*, *-ar*, *-ir*, *-aš*, *-ab*, are compared in detail with similar endings in place-names belonging to Elam and the Zagros region,¹ with very plausible results. However, endings are notoriously uncertain evidence, especially where none of the names appear to have doublets outside of the great river valleys. A comparison of some absolutely certain Sumerian common nouns in two syllables or more with the place-names yields very interesting results. We naturally exclude words which may be Semitic loans. With place-names in *-ag(k)*, such as *Šurup(p)ak*, *Larak*, *Illak* (a name of Erech),² *Akšak*, *Apirak*, *Ašnun(n)ak*,³ compare Sumerian words like *azak* (*asakku*), *ellak*, *kalak*, *ħursak* (*ħuršānu*), *ursak* (*uršānu*), *balak* (*balaggu*), *barak*, *duḅ(b)isak*, *nisak* (*nisakku*), *isak* (*iššakku*), *santak* (*santakku*). With names in *-ar*, such as *Arar*, and *-ir*, such as *Zimbir*, *Tintir*, *Subir*, compare *agar* (*ugāru*), *ingar* (*igāru*), *amar*, *engar* (*ikkaru*), *ubar*, *babbar*, *gišimar* (*gišimmaru*), *kindar*, *dupsar* (*ṭupšarru*), *namtar*, *zabar* (*siparru*), *saġar*, *šagar*, and *esir*, *egir*, *bappir*, *gigir*, *dingir*, *tibir*, *šibir*, *kunir*, *šunir*, *nimgir* (*libir* E. S.). With names in *-aš*, like *Lagaš*, cf. *amaš*, *garaš*, etc. Names in *-ab*, such as *Adab* (*Udab*, *Usab*), *Kullab*, *Illab*, *Ĥallab*, or in *-ib*, like

¹ It may be observed that we really do not know how far Sumerian place-names extend toward the east, and that there are indications of a very old and important Sumerian occupation in the East Tigris region. It is by no means impossible that *Šušinak*, for example, is of Sumerian origin. For *Awak* = *Awan* (Speiser, pp. 40-41), cf. Sum. *ħuš-sag* = *ħušan* in Elam (Scheil, *RA* 22, 45 ff.).

² There does not seem to be any adequate reason for assuming *Illag* and *Illab* to be dialect forms of *Uruk*, as supposed by Poebel, *Gram.*, p. 29.

³ *Awak*, *Šušinak*, etc., may also belong here; see preceding note.

Barsib, *Illib*,⁴ may be compared with words like *lagab*, *alġab* (*allu-happu*), or *išib* (*išippu*), *kišib*, etc. We may also add a few comparisons with other endings, not adduced by the author. E. g., *-ad* appears in *Dilbad*, *Marad*, as well as in such words as *alad* and *sipad* ("shepherd"); *-uk* in *Uruk* also appears in *uduk*, *simuk*, *buluk*, *uguk*, *uzuk*, etc. The ending in *Agade* (*Akkadû*, not *Akkad*, which is the Hebrew form)⁵ is paralleled by *unuge*, *ade(a)*, *gude*, etc.; the ending in *Gudua* (*Kutû*) is found in *imdua*, *narua*, etc.; that in *Nibru* (*Nippuru*) and *Girsu*⁶ is found in *ildu*, *anšu*, *amaru*, *abzu*, *eššu*, *geštu(g)*, *isimu-usmu*, *illuru*, *sulu*, *suzbu*, etc. One would hardly think of separating the name *Dilbad* from the adjective "bright," applied to the planet Venus, nor the name *Aratta* from the word *aratta*, "glorious," nor *Marad* from the synonym of *banda*, "mighty." It is true that the etymology of Sumerian place-names is generally obscure, and that the most natural suggestions, such as Deimel's explanation of the name *Lagaš* (*la*, "settlement" and *gaš*, "a bird"), or the old etymology of *Uruk* as *unu(k)*, "town," are problematical. This situation, however, is not restricted to place-names, but is also true of most Sumerian etymology. Sumerian has suffered to such an extent from phonetic decay, resulting in a vast number of monosyllabic homonyms, that almost any etymology is doubtful; there are few transparent nominal compounds like *egal* and *lugal*. The numerous Sumerian dialects,⁷ with often profound phonetic differences, undoubtedly crossed one another, producing apparent anomalies, just as in French. Besides, it must be borne in mind that the Sumerians had the custom of abbreviating long names; cf. *Dumuzi* and *Damu*

⁴ Contrast Poebel, *Gram.*, p. 27.

⁵ The discovery of the Aramaic writing מרדכי and the Nuzian *mât Aggati* (for *Akkadi*) have proved that the last vowel was long. The name *mât Akkadi* does not mean "land of the Accadian," but simply "land of Accad" (*Akkadû*).

⁶ Langdon may be right in explaining the name (E. S. *Mersi*) as meaning "inundation."

⁷ The best treatments of the dialects are by Poebel, *Gram.*, esp. pp. 4 ff., 28 ff., and *ZA* 5 (1929), 130 ff. In Elam there was a special dialect of Sumerian, presumably dating from very early times; in it *dingir* appears as *tihir*, *giš* as *hiš*, *huš-sag* as *hušan*, etc. (Scheil, *RA* 22 [1925], 45 ff.). The Hittite texts also occasionally reproduce a peculiar type of Sumerian, possibly a northwestern dialect; cf. Friedrich, *MVAG* 34, 34, n. 1.

for *Da(u)mu-zid-abzu*, *Šagan* (Acc. *Šakkan*) for *Ama-šagan-gub*, **Maluduk* (*Maruduk*) for *Asari-mu(ga)lu-duk*, or abbreviated royal names like *Lugal-anda*, *Eannadu*, *Gudea*, etc. Langdon may be right in regarding *Zimbir* (*Sippir*) as an abbreviated form of *UD-KIB-NUN-KI*, i. e., *Kib-bir-NUN*; cf. *Kengi(r) > Šumer* (Speiser, pp. 55 f.). In *Arar* = *Larsa(m)* it would appear that the standard Sumerian form was more abbreviated than the later Accadian; it is well known that the Accadian forms of names often go back to Sumerian forms which are older than the ones found in the inscriptions. When a royal name of transparent Sumerian type, like *A-anni-pada*, appears later as *Nanni* (Gadd), one may not unnaturally, and yet erroneously, think of Anatolian names like *Nanas*, etc.

Chapter III, "The Early Civilizations of the Near East," is a very instructive and interesting study of the archaeological material, marshalled in support of the view that the painted pottery of the Susa I and related types belonged to pre-Sumerian peoples of Caucasian (Japhetic) race. It is quite true that the use of this pottery spread from the northeast, and that it was very much at home in the Zagros, which seems to have been occupied by Caucasian peoples from the earliest times. However, no conclusion can be drawn from the fact that the painted ware of the Susa I type passed out of use some centuries before the First Dynasty of Ur. As illustrations of the change of pottery types where no corresponding racial change can be established, we can do no better than to point to the successive sway of geometric, Corinthian and Rhodian, black figured, and red figured wares in Greece, or the great change in the pottery of Egypt with the First Dynasty, or of Palestine between 1000 and 800 B. C. The Sumerians developed such an extraordinary diversity of dialects that we must allow them a respectable time in which to evolve them. Moreover, since the Accadians demonstrably entered Mesopotamia before the dawn of monumental history, it would be impossible to explain their complete dependence upon the Sumerians if the latter were intruders, nor is it reasonable to suppose that the latter were so gifted that they forged far ahead of the other races of Mesopotamia in a comparatively short time. A very strong argument in favor of the identification of the painted pottery folk with the Sumerians may be drawn from the following considerations. In the northwest

Sumerian influence was very powerful, even before the entrance of the Accadians upon the scene, as is shown, e. g., by many direct loans from Sumerian in Canaanite (Hebrew).⁸ Moreover, the spread of Sumerian place-names in this region agrees almost exactly with the diffusion of the painted pottery. The chalcolithic of Palestine and southern Syria is entirely different, as is also the chalcolithic of Asia Minor. In Syria we find painted pottery only in the alluvial valley of Aleppo, in the Upper Euphrates valley, as well as in the valleys of the Balīḥ and Ḥabūr, as far north as Rās el-'Ain. Now, it is precisely in this region that Sumerian place-names are abundant: cf. *Mari* ("ship-city"), like *Mari* in eastern Babylonia; *Ḥabur* ("river of abundance") = *Ḥubur*, for **Ḥebur*, like *ḥenbur* > *ḥabburu* (cf. Poebel, *Gram.*, p. 13: *ḥe-mu* becomes *ḥa-mu*- and *ḥu-mu*-); *Barsip* (later *Til-Barsip*) = *Barsip* (*Barzeb*, "good sanctuary"?); *Kargameš* ("quay of Gameš"; cf. *Gilgameš*);⁹ *Ḥalab* = *Ḥal(l)ab* in central Babylonia.¹⁰ Since the names in *-ab* (*ab*, "settlement, abode") are particularly common in Babylonia, it is interesting to note *Nirab* (the combination with Assyrian *nêribu*, "pass" is very secondary), *Zulab*, *Tarab*, in the vicinity of Aleppo. Archaeologically, the culture of the Upper Euphrates region was almost purely Sumerian in the early third millennium, as shown by Von Oppenheim's investigations at Tell Ḥalâf (Guzana; cf. Sumerian words like *guza*, *guzal*, *usan*, *pisan*, etc.), as well as by stray discoveries elsewhere. The knife handle of Gebel el-'Arâq shows how directly Egypt was influenced by this

⁸ Cf. Albright, *JPOS* 8, 253 (with reference to unpublished studies), and especially Poebel, *ZA* 5 (1929), 145.

⁹ Cf. *JAOS* 40, 319.

¹⁰ The name of Aleppo is a peculiarly ambiguous one, because of similarities to other place-names which lie well out of the Sumerian zone. The Anatolian town of Ḥalpa(s) has a name which appears to resemble it closely, but just such a superficial resemblance is provided by Sum. *ḥalba* (*ḡalba*), Acc. *ḥalpû*, "frost." The Assyrian spelling *Ḥalman* is probably derived from the name *Ḥalman* in southeastern Assyria (cf. *JAOS* 45, 212 ff.), but it is surely too much to believe that the dialectic variant *Arman* was also a variant of *Ḥalman-Ḥalab*, as held by Smith in Gadd and Legrain, *Royal Inscriptions*, pp. 79 ff. (accepted by Speiser, p. 154). Dhorme, *RB* 1929, 132, suggests an identification with Mount Hermon. The reviewer prefers to keep Armanum in the East Tigris country, regarding Naram-Sin's statements as vague. The subject will be discussed elsewhere.

civilization.¹¹ Nor is it accidental that the religion of Syria shows such profound Sumerian influence, and that purely Sumerian gods like Išhara, Zababa and Nergal appear here from the earliest times. That the name of the Sumerian flood-hero was transmitted in its purest form *Zi(u)sudu* only at Bambûk (Bambyce)-Mabûg, between Aleppo and Charchemish, is also suggestive.¹²

In chapter IV the author discusses the Lullu and the Guti, on which he is able to provide us with much important new material, as well as many interesting combinations, all of which are characterized by his usual prudence. Considering the nature of the subject, however, it is not surprising that the reviewer differs from him in his treatment of Babylonian place-names, many of which have the same endings as those in Lullu and Guti names. This argument has been fully considered above, so we need not repeat ourselves. We would like to make a great many additional observations, but since they bear mostly on subsidiary details, we refrain. Speiser wrote before the publication of the fourth fascicle of the *Reallexikon der Assyriologie*, and so was not able to utilize Forrer's important discovery that the name hitherto read *Kurîi* should be read *Papîi*, (= *Babîi*, *Babanîi*, Eg. *Pbh*) and that "*Kirîi*" should be read *Habîi* (Forrer, *op. cit.*, pp. 255, 268 f., 280), in his discussion on pp. 112 ff.

Chapter V is devoted to "The Kassites and the Hurrians." This is the most important section of the book, since the author here discusses the subject about which the work developed. The reading *Hurri* instead of *Harri*, sufficiently established now for cuneiform, is also certain for Egyptian, as Speiser suggests (p. 132, above), without details. The common name *P³-H³-rw*, "the Syrian," was pronounced *Pihuru*, as we know from the Amarna vocalizations *Pihura*, *Pahura*, and *Puhuru*, etc. The Egyptians did not double their consonants, and only occasionally attempted to indicate doubling of foreign consonants in transcription, so *Huru* = **Hurru*. That the Greek reading "Horite" is preferable to the Hebrew "Hivite" was also maintained strongly by the reviewer (cf. *JSOR* 7, 1923, 5, n. 3). That the inhabitants of Shechem

¹¹ Until the publication of Von Oppenheim's remarkable discoveries it will be impossible to discuss this matter at greater length. Cf. Hertz, *Die Kultur um den persischen Golf*, pp. 97 f. for archaeological comparisons outside of the Tell Hālâf circle.

¹² Cf. *AJSL* 41, 78 f.

were really Horites (p. 132) is also shown by the identity of the name *Biraššena* (pronounced *Birassena*) on a tablet from that town published by Böhl (*ZDPV* 49, 325 ff.) with Nuzian *Birazzina-Birazzana* (Chiera, *Texts of Varied Contents*, No. 6, *passim*). The Egyptians applied the name *Hur(r)u* to Syria, while the Hittites, as now generally admitted, employed it as a synonym for Mitanni and *Ḫanigalbat*, a territory which included northern and central Syria. Early in the second millennium there must surely have been a much more powerful state called *Ḫurru* than we should infer from the later extent of Mitanni. How completely blended the Canaanite, Amorite, and *Ḫurrian* elements of Syria became will be illustrated in a forthcoming article by the reviewer in the *Archiv für Orientforschung*, on the god *Šulmân*.—On p. 151 Speiser has made a very important observation with regard to the ideogram for the river *Baliḫ*, *ID-DINGIR-ILLAD* (*GĪD^{lad}*). However, it is likely that the ideogram meant originally "River of *Ḫarrân*" (cf. "River of Sippir" as a name of the Euphrates, and "River of Tupliaš" as a name of the *Uknû*), since *âl GĪD* is a common ideogram for *Ḫarrân*. In fact, the latter name may have been introduced by the Accadians in the third millennium instead of an original *Illad*. The god *Illad* is mentioned in a list published by Schroeder, *KAVI*, No. 63, col. 5, end; cf. the god *Ḫabur*, *KAVI* No. 42, II, 37 and 43, II, 5. The pronunciation *baliḫ* may then be secondary.

In the last chapter the author gives a synthesis, characterized by the same breadth of outlook combined with accuracy in detail which we have learned to associate with his work. The reviewer agrees with most of his conclusions and observations; it is, in fact, only when we come to the question of the antiquity of the Sumerian occupation of Mesopotamia that we seriously differ. Even here it is not, in the reviewer's opinion, due to any defect of method, but solely to the obscurity and ambiguity of our material, that the author reaches results which are opposed to ours. The book will prove a mine of information to the serious student; it is written so clearly and attractively that no intelligent reader can fail to understand. The author has paid a delicate compliment to the American Schools of Oriental Research by dedicating the book to them; we who are interested in the success of the Schools will accept the compliment as an honor to them, and as a good omen for their future prosperity.

Die Kultur um den persischen Golf und ihre Ausbreitung (Klio, zwanzigstes Beiheft). By AMELIA HERTZ. Leipzig: DIETERICH, 1930. Pp. iv + 152, with eight plates.

Fräulein Hertz, already well known to students of ancient Oriental archaeology for her comparative studies, has now undertaken a most ambitious enterprise. In this closely printed volume she attempts to prove that there was a relatively homogeneous civilization in Babylonia, Elam, and the Indus Valley, which lasted from about 6000 B. C., when Susa I began, to about 3200, when the ancient culture was destroyed by a great irruption of barbarians from the north. The barbarian irruption which she postulates came after the period of the rich tombs of Mes-šár-kalama¹ and ŠUB.AD and before the First Dynasty of Ur (Mes-anni-pada, etc.). She believes that it was this barbarian invasion that was referred to originally by the traditions of the *abûbu*, or deluge, which were later misunderstood and connected with a great inundation—the Flood. The antediluvian dynasties, grouped together under ten names of kings, she would explain as belonging to the *Kultur um den persischen Golf* (pp. 87 f.). Her theory has at least the merit or originality, fantastic though it is.

The author begins her monograph with a detailed exposition of the results of excavations in sites and strata of the earliest period in Mesopotamia, Susiana, and India: Kish, Ur, el-'Obeid, Eridu, Šuruppak, Nippur, Adab, Lagaš, Zurgul and el-Hibbah, Assur, Susa, Mussiân, Mohenjo Daro, and Harappa. The description of the results is discursive, sometimes inexact, and seldom accompanied by any references whatever. Her comparative chronology generally rests on very slender foundations. Her elaborate comparisons between different phases of culture at Susa and Tepe Mussiân on the one hand, and Babylonian cities on the other, is already hopelessly antiquated by the latest stratigraphic investigations at Kish, Ur, and Erech, where Watelin, Woolley, and Jordan have obtained extraordinarily instructive sequences of cultures, quite bewildering in their multiplicity. However, these excavations have proved conclusively that there can be no question of any

¹ Since the order of characters in a word was very variable in early Sumerian inscriptions, this reading seems preferable to *Mes-kalam-DUG*. It would mean (if not abbreviated) "Hero of the Totality of the Land (Babylonia)."

violent interruption in the cultural history of Babylonia after the period of Mes-šár-kalama and before the First Dynasty of Ur. There is a normal development of culture, with an oscillation of wealth and prosperity between different Babylonian cities, such as Ur, Kish, and Lagaš, so that each has its own turn of hegemony and wealth, followed by a period of reduced prosperity, when the art becomes noticeably provincial (e. g., the period of Ur-Nanše at Lagaš). Quite aside from all artistic and archaeological indications, the evidence of inscriptions is sufficient to disprove Fräulein Hertz's hypothesis of a cataclysmic interruption in the evolution of this culture. The script of the time of Mes-šár-kalama is substantially identical with that of the pre-Sargonic royal inscriptions in general. The latest occupation of Šuruppak (Fârah) she refers to the end of her "antediluvian" civilization (p. 47). However, cuneiform tablets of the Fârah type have now been found at Kish, Ur, and elsewhere in Babylonia, where they represent a transition between the older pictorial script and the Lagaš cursive of the latest pre-Sargonic period. So similar are most of the characters that several distinguished Assyriologists have tried to prove that the Lagaš and Fârah texts are practically contemporaneous. There is not the slightest indication anywhere in these texts that such a catastrophe as Fräulein Hertz supposes—which she seriously compares with the barbarian irruption which put an end to the Roman Empire (p. 89)—took place at that time.

In general Fräulein Hertz operates only with unwritten material, and carefully omits to mention the inscriptions, while her discussion of the script (pp. 104-117) is hopelessly inadequate. She maintains that the geometric and stylized ornament on vases of Susa and Tepe Mussiân represents a stage in the evolution of pictorial script, and compares individual motives on these vases with proto-Elamite characters. This is so obviously a generalization from the undoubted artistic relation of ornament and script in all ancient systems of writing that it requires no discussion in our limited space. Her remarks on p. 116 with regard to the development of Sumerian are fanciful in the extreme. The barbarians, she thinks, borrowed both the Sumerian script and the language (mentioned in that order). Her idea that the language of the Ur-Nanše texts represents a very helpless effort to write Sumerian, shortly after the irruption of the barbarians (Semitic

Accadians?), whereas Ur-Nanše's grandson Eannatum was more conversant with the language, must be read in the light of Landsberger's observations (*OLZ*, 1931, 122).

The discussion of supposed mathematical survivals from this ancient culture of the Persian Gulf in later Babylonian, Egyptian, and Indian civilizations, while disproportionately long (pp. 118-140), is the weakest part of her argument. From the facts that the Egyptians of the second millennium B. C. were in possession of relatively complicated geometric formulae which they frequently misunderstood, and that the geometric figures in their treatises on mathematics are very awkwardly drawn, she concludes that they must have derived their mathematical knowledge from an external source, from the same *Urkultur*. Her argument is not only illogical, it is also written in apparent ignorance of the fact that the great flowering of Egyptian science and art was during the period of the first four dynasties, especially in the third, whose greatest scholar, Imuthes, was later deified for his extraordinary achievements. It was in the time of those dynasties that the greatest progress in architecture, medicine, theology, and other sciences was made, and that the empirical method obtained many of its most signal triumphs. The exactness of the dimensions of the Great Pyramid still excites the admiration of trained builders. To trace the science of the second millennium back to the Persian Gulf, some thousands of years earlier, without reckoning with the Pyramid Age, is a feat which shows a lack of the most elementary historical sense.

The same is true, *mutatis mutandis*, of Fräulein Hertz's discussion of the Indian material. Following Bürk she points out that the Indians were acquainted with the Pythagorean theorem in the time of the mathematical treatise called the *Āpastamba Śulba Sūtra*, which deals with the construction of altars, and probably dates from early in the second half of the first pre-Christian millennium. Bürk maintains (*ZDMG* 1901, 550-56) that the *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, dating from the end of the second or the beginning of the first millennium B. C., was already acquainted with the Pythagorean theorem. But he is strongly opposed by Oldenberg² and especially by Dumont, whose proof seems to be

² *Die Weltanschauung der Brāhmaṇa-Texte*, Göttingen, 1919, p. 233, note

conclusive.³ According to Dumont the Śat. Br. constructs the successive enlargements of the Agni altar, not by adding to the *mahāvedi* one-seventh of the area of the *mahāvedi* of the *saptavidha*, but by adding to each of the dimensions of the former one-seventh of the corresponding dimension of the latter. It was then between the time of the Śat. Br. and the date of the Āp. Śulb. that the Indians became acquainted with the Pythagorean theorem—which at once disposes of Hertz's hypothesis. It may be added that Lehmann-Haupt has practically disposed of her idea with regard to the derivation of Indian mathematics, not from the later Babylonians, but from the *Urkultur*, in his footnote on p. 132. Incidentally, we may observe that the great flowering of Babylonian mathematics and astronomy (aside from its development in the third millennium) took place between 600 and 300 B. C., and that we have reasons for placing the corresponding Indian intellectual movement in the same age. The Persian Empire provided the necessary liaison, and it is no longer necessary to explain such contacts as dating from the Alexandrian age, or from a hypothetical *Urkultur*.

Since there is, then, not the slightest reason to derive either Egyptian or Indian mathematics from the *Kultur um den persischen Golf*, and since the author herself admits that early Babylonian mathematics shows a lamentable decline from its hypothetical source, we may reject her combinations in the field of geometry without further ado.

Fräulein Hertz's monograph is a most stimulating contribution to a subject of which we still know little. There are problems to be considered, and there were extremely early contacts between the civilizations of Babylonia, India, and Egypt, some of which will employ the pen of the reviewer in the near future. But these contacts belong to the relatively primitive age when the cultures in question had not yet crystallized, and when barbarian commerce and trade relations were already developed (contrast p. 92!). The irrigation-cultures of the chalcolithic age had much in common, but we must not exaggerate their artistic and intellectual achievements.

Johns Hopkins University.

W. F. ALBRIGHT.

4. I owe this reference, as well as the following one, to the kindness of my colleague, Dr. P. E. Dumont.

³ See his communication to the Académie Royale de Belgique, *Bulletin de la Classe des Lettres*, 1923, pp. 280-97.

Mughal Painting. By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY. Catalogue of the Indian Collections in the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Part VI. Cambridge: HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1930. Pp. 114, with a frontispiece in colour and 74 plates.

Musulman Painting XIIth-XVIIth Century. By E. BLOCHET. Transl. from the French by Cicely M. Binyon, with an introduction by Sir E. Denison Ross. London: METHUEN AND COMPANY, 1929. Pp. x + 124, with 12 plates in colour and 188 in collotype.

Two great names and two very important books, but what a difference in style! A. Coomaraswamy describes his collection quietly, almost epically, and E. Blochet, touching an ocean of various questions, is full of youthful ardor.

In the first work, following the introduction, which contains a brief sketch of the development of Mughal (or so-called "Indo-Persian") painting, there are tables of the Mughal dynasty and of the Qutb Shahs. In these tables we find several items which do not coincide with the dates and names adopted in the well-known books—*The Mohammadan Dynasties* by S. Lane-Poole, and *Manuel de Généalogie et de Chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam* by E. de Zambaur. It would be interesting to know the sources and authorities of our author. Next we have the detailed description of the 317 paintings, some of which are represented by plates. They are divided into different schools. The description of each picture is followed by the full scientific apparatus, i. e., explanations are given, quotations and special literature are mentioned, inscriptions are translated and transliterated. Unfortunately, Dr. Coomaraswamy uses transliteration which is extremely difficult for printing; as a result, there are many errata. In the question of the reception of Prince Khurram (p. 44, No. LXXIII) the date is wrongly calculated; according to Mahler's (not Mahlung's!) *Vergleichungs-Tabellen*, 11 Shawal 1026 A. H. is October 12, 1617 A. D., as Rogers and Beveridge have.

This work by Dr. Coomaraswamy, like his others, is distinguished for a complete bibliography, for which scholars must be very thankful, as well as for three indices at the end of the book. The plates are artistically reproduced.

At the beginning of my note on the second book I wish to quote

some lines from the introduction by Sir Denison Ross: (p. vii) "Persian book illustrations—which represent almost all that is best in this delicate art—are so intimately connected with Persian literature that most of the spade work in regard to its appreciation and interpretation has perforce to be done by scholars who have devoted their lives to Islamic literature"; (p. viii) "Nowadays, unfortunately, manuscripts containing fine miniatures are apt to be ruthlessly torn asunder and the pictures sold one by one." How many times these thoughts have been repeated by scholars everywhere and still we do not see specialists in art cooperating with orientalists. Moreover, because of the atrocious custom mentioned in the second quotation, this country lost forever a wonderful illuminated copy of the *Jami at-Tawarikh* by Rasid ad-din, which was written in the 14th century and belonged to the library of Shahrokh, son of Tamerlane.

The contents of this work by M. Blochet are enormous but condensed in a few (117) pages. In the first chapter the author describes the life of the heathen Arab tribes, the spirit of Islam, and the influence of classical civilization and Christianity. Further, he gives a new and remarkable explanation of why Islam forbids the representation in painting of animate objects. He speaks of the tolerance of Mohammedans and, thanks to it, the preservation under Islamic yoke of the old traditions among the Christians who were the teachers of the Moslem world in the art of painting; he discusses also the rôle of Central Asia and Buddhism. The study of Musulman painting is historically divided into several periods from the beginning of the Caliphate down to the middle of the 17th century, the time of the real end of this art, in the opinion of M. Blochet.

The work is written with soul and heart, often in poetical style, and the great orientalist has mobilized all his knowledge. The text was finished in May, 1926 and the terminal note in August, 1929; thus the author had enough time to verify his conclusions. The principal idea is that the art of Islam, from the evolutionary point of view, is a post-Byzantine form; that only one art has ever existed, and that is Classic Art; and that the theory of the influence of the East on Western art is a fancy born from the combination of several errors. Sometimes the author is perfectly right; for instance, (p. 68) when he writes that the Huns were Turks. Too many scholars have wrongly attributed to the Huns Mongolian,

Finnish, and even Slavonic origin. But some of his sentences are dangerous; he thinks that (p. 75) "the invention of a 'Scythian' art, of a 'Sarmatian' and 'Greco-Sarmatian' art . . . is a myth based on objects without style, formless, and of most dubious authenticity . . ."

M. Blochet's book has many audacious ideas, disputable parallels, and hazardous conclusions; nevertheless it offers new thoughts, awakens the mind of an educated reader, compels us to reflect and to revise our old traditions—and in this is the author's great merit.

New York City.

N. MARTINOVITCH.

Vedic Variants. A Study of the Variant Readings of the Repeated Mantras of the Veda. By M. BLOOMFIELD and F. EDGERTON. Volume I, The Verb. Special Publications of the LINGUISTIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA. Philadelphia, 1930, pp. 340. \$5.00 net.

At the beginning of the preface of his *Rig-Veda Repetitions* Bloomfield wrote: "The present work is a natural—one might say inevitable—outgrowth of my *Vedic Concordance*. I saw this early in the day when, soon after the publication of that work, I printed my article 'On Certain Work in Continuance of the Vedic Concordance', *JAOS.* xxix. 286 ff. In that article I outlined three principal tasks: 1. The treatment of the Rig-Veda Repetitions. 2. A Reverse Concordance. 3. The treatment of the Vedic Variants." Now comes the first volume of *Vedic Variants*, which work as a whole will "present a grammatical and stylistic study of the entire mass of the variant readings in the repeated mantras of the Vedic tradition": the repeated mantras which show variants number about 10,000 and the variants "range all the way from change of a single letter in a single word to radical rearrangements of the whole text." The variants may have been made intentionally or not, there may or may not be a change of meaning, and they all in all illumine in some way practically every part of Vedic grammar, textual criticism, and interpretation. The arrangement and development of the material presented many difficulties of several sorts, such as arose out of the nature of the Vedic dialect, the differences of schools, the ritualistic nature of the mantras, and also the fact that they were handed down by oral tradition; the arrangement of the material for discussion in this book is not too rigidly

schematized. The principal categories into which the phenomena of the variants may be grouped are Phonetics, Noun Formation, Noun Inflection, The Verb, and Order of Words; and there are yet other minor ones to be treated. The major part of this first volume (The Verb) was written by Bloomfield and somewhat revised by Edgerton who wrote the last and longest chapter from the lists which Bloomfield had collected; in the succeeding volumes Edgerton's part will be much larger.

The great worth of the *Concordance* has been increasingly demonstrated these many years; and that worth is not in its labor-saving convenience but is due to that repetitious character of much of Vedic verse which prompted Bloomfield to undertake the compilation. The elaboration of the variants brings an intensification of the value of the *Concordance*. One turns up a pāda in the *Concordance* and finds that it appears, with variants, in several texts; then turning it up in Vedic Variants one may find that many another pāda shows variants of similar sort. Under various conditions such information may be very useful in one way or another. It will be sufficient merely to state that in textual criticism the Vedic Variants is a book which will have to be literally a hand-book for the editor of a text: while access to all recorded occurrences and variants of a given passage and to many similar variants will be helpful it will not, however, always be decisive in establishing an acceptable reading. If for an editor there seems to arise the necessity of a choice between an indicative form and an imperative he will not be inclined to settle the matter subjectively after studying the long list of indicatives which interchange with imperatives and other moods. But the variants which show interchanges between moods, or between voices, or between tenses make more important contributions toward our comprehension of the syntactical functions of those inflectional species, and the importance is not so much in the fact that functions of forms come together and overlap, it is rather in this case in the abundance of instances. The following sentences from the first paragraph of the chapter on the moods (page 53) give very keen intimation of the bearing of this work on Sanskrit syntax: "In any case the frequency of these changes testifies eloquently to that genuine instability in the use of moods which characterizes Hindu speech at least up to the time of the modern vernaculars. And because they concern all moods, the following pages are a kind of negative syntax of the

ancient Sanskrit moods. Needless to say, the conditions described in this chapter happen to be unparalleled in the history of recorded literature and speech." Realization of that genuine instability will certainly become more vivid through familiarity with this work.

Attention may be directed particularly to certain points made in this volume. Some Vedic forms and functions are at times ambiguous, such as unaugmented forms; the sort of variants which replace these might be expected to help remove the ambiguity, but we read (p. 21, § 9), "the evidence of the variants taken by itself rarely if at all fixes the syntactical value of augmented preterites." In the chapter on voices it appears more evident than before that in the RV the distinction between active and middle was well on the way to obliteration. Variations in person and number are sometimes startling but usually a clear and sure explanation lies close at hand for any one who understands the ritual performance and the relation between priest and sacrificer, and their respective activities: interesting also, and not always so readily explicable, in respect to person and number are the methods of expressing generic propositions, for it appears that these may be expressed by any person of singular or plural and a variant in any person may be substituted (§ § 291, 314, 360). And then there are irregular agreements such as a verb in the third person with subject in the second (variants of which show more strictly correct concord): these pādas with discord seem to be the expression of some momentary mental flutter, and should usually not be emended.

This work when completed will probably contribute much to linguistic science. If the treatment of the verbal variants suggests a negation of syntax, that is in no way a denial of value: other parts should illumine some phases of the general problems of inflections, order of words, and groupings of words in the expression of concepts.

In the preface of the *Vedic Concordance* Bloomfield wrote, "Vedic literary production is often in a high degree imitative and mechanical;" and Edgerton quoting this in the preface of *Vedic Variants* (p. 12) amplifies it with the remark, "a trait which it shares with most religious literature." But the words "religious literature" are often used to indicate such works as Augustine's *Confessions* and Pascal's *Pensées*, or the *Divine Comedy* and *Paradise Lost*; such works can hardly be called imitative and

mechanical, nor do the words apply to the great hymns and prayers, though they might apply to some portions of some rituals. There are parts of some "sacred books" other than the Vedas which may depend upon sources but they have transmuted their borrowings so that they do not really deserve the adjectives and to the reviewer it seems that the words do not aptly describe the Avesta, the Koran, or the Bible; rather it seems that insofar as the method of composing Vedic hymns was imitative and mechanical just there do we find a distinctive feature of the Vedas. What the Atharva Veda sometimes does with a Rig Veda line is mechanical in the extreme; and nowhere else can be found ten thousand such repetitions with variants. It does not then seem to the reviewer that the *Vedic Variants* have much to contribute to the study of religious literature in regard to its imitative method.

All who are interested in Vedic studies will especially welcome this publication; every one must heartily appreciate the support given to the project by the Linguistic Society of America and by the American Council of Learned Societies, and it is gratifying that assurance has recently been given by the Council that its support will be continued which assures the appearance of the next part rather speedily. To Edgerton it must be particularly gratifying to be carrying to completion this splendid work conceived and begun by his honored teacher.

LEROY CARR BARRET.

Trinity College, Hartford.

American Schools of Oriental Research. Publications of the Baghdad School. Texts: Vol. II. Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi. By EDWARD CHIERA. Paris: GEUTHNER, 1930.

The first volume of this series, in which Professor Chiera publishes the "Kirkuk" tablets unearthed by him in 1925-26 (reviewed by me *JAOS* 49, 178 ff.), comprised chiefly sale-adoptions. The present volume contains 100 declarations in court, before witnesses or before the *halzuñle* and the judges, and 21 sale-adoptions (201-221) supplementing those in Vol I.

As in the first volume, Téhiptilla, the son of Puhishenni, appears as the principal party in most of these transactions (71 tablets); his son Ennamati appears in 101, 107, 110, 113, 118, 121, 127,

138, 158, 163, 174, 207; Takku the son of Ennamati in 120; Tarmittilla the son of Shurkitilla in 102, 103, 108, 115, 147, 151; Hutiya the son of Kushshuya in 117(?), 119; Gil-Teshub the son of Hutiya in 111, 116, 125, 143, 181, 186, 219; Mushea the son of Hashiya in 216, 221; Huite the son of Mushea in 150, 189; 3 sons of Hilbishshuh in 124 (cf. 198, 204). Isolated individuals, occasionally women (139, 192, 218), appear in the other texts.

The sale-adoptions (201-221) are mostly of the usual type and need not detain us here; in 14 texts Tehiptilla is adopted, in 5, other persons; 218 is the sale of a girl into daughtership for 10 shekels of silver, 204 is a tablet of brotherhood in which an actual brother is adopted.

For the most part the declarations in court (101-200) are confirmations or corroborations of previous transactions, although occasionally they seem to take the place of regular contracts. We may classify them as follows:

1. Sale-adoption (*marûtu*): 105, 106, 109, 122, 126, 129, 132, 133, 142, 145, 146, 148, 149, 153, 159, 160, 166, 169, 171, 172, 175, 176, 178, 180, 188, 193, 196, 197, 200.
2. Exchange (*šubiultu*) of houses: 131, 157, 183, 194; of fields: 104, 114, 136, 137, 141, 144, 152, 156, 165, 167, 168, 170(?), 173, 185, 187, 199.
3. Security (*ditennûtu*): 102, 103, 111, 189, 192.
4. Sale of fields: 112, 140; of horses: 108(?), 143, 198; of slaves: 115, 118(?), 119, 163, 179, 195.
5. Loans of barley: 150, 182; payments of debt: 128, 130, 147, 151, 155; receipts: 133, 139, 181.
6. Confirmation of transfer of real estate: 116, 117, 121, 134, 154, 161, 164, 174(?), 190, 191.
7. Marriage: 120, 186; inheritance: 124; children restored to parents: 113.
8. Accusation of theft: 125; lawsuits: 127; 177(?).
9. Miscellaneous and fragmentary: 123, 135, 138, 158, 162, 184.

These texts contain a number of Hurrian vernacular words: *halzuhle* officials (passim), *mašawalli* (153. 8; inherited portion?); words descriptive of the soil: *paihu* (101. 4), *halahwa* (101. 8, 14), *hawalhu* (137. 7), *puhizzaru* (107. 4; 159. 4, 26); and others. Some texts throw a welcome light upon the economic values of the time (about 1450 B. C.): a slave was worth 30 shekels of silver (115,

cf. 195) as in Ex. 21, 22 (in the Code of Hammurabi, §§ 116, 214, 252, 20 shekels); a maid servant was sold for 36 goats (119), another (179) for 2 oxen, a donkey, and 10 sheep (the equivalent of 40 shekels); in 186 the bride-price is 30 shekels, or 13 homers of barley (worth 3 shekels), 13 sheep, and one ox; a horse was sold for 10 shekels (143), another (198) for 45 homers of barley and 5 minas of lead.

The accuracy and clearness of Professor Chiera's copies need no comment: his high standards are well known. In rare instances the text seemed slightly incorrect, but the errors may be scribal. I would suggest the following emendations: *ir* for *ni* (105. 20), *ki* for *di* (118. 7), *di* for *ki* (128. 6), *en-ni* for *en-u* (212. 29), *um* for *ab* (157. 12; 179. 21), *awiharu* for *la* (160. 7). In 148.3 read [*ha-al-zu-u*]*h-li-e*; in 204. 18 the context requires *iddin*, or the like, in place of *il-gi*.

It is to be hoped that the remaining volumes of this important series will appear at briefer intervals, particularly since, if my information is correct, the complete manuscript is ready for publication.

ROBERT H. PFEIFFER.

Harvard University.

Mishna Manuscript Codex Kaufmann A. 50. Edited by Prof. G. BEER. Haag, M. NIJHOFF, 1929.

It has been the dream of scholars for many years to obtain a reliable text of the Mishnah which forms, as is well known, the foundation upon which the structure of the Talmud is built. A critically dependable edition of a text, however, cannot be prepared unless old manuscripts of it are available. In the case of the Mishnah and the Talmud, only a few manuscripts have been preserved down to the present day.

One of the few old manuscripts that have been miraculously saved from destruction is the famous Munich codex comprising the whole body of the Babylonian Talmud. This codex came to the attention of scholars at a comparatively early date, and voluminous collections of various readings culled from it were published for the use of students of the Talmud. Nevertheless, these collections, however well done, could not serve as a substitute for the codex itself. Only in 1912, when under the direction of the late

Prof. H. L. Strack, of Berlin, a complete photographic reproduction of it was published did this remarkable manuscript become accessible to scholars the world over. It immediately took its rightful position as an indispensable sourcebook for every branch of Talmudic research.

Although the Munich codex contains also the Mishnah, the text of the latter as found there represents only the Babylonian redaction of the original Palestinian Mishnah, adapted to the needs of the Babylonian Jews. An important step towards the restoration of the original Mishnic text was made in 1883, when W. H. Lowe published from a unique manuscript, now in Cambridge, the text of the Palestinian redaction of the Mishnah upon which the Palestinian Talmud is based. Even more valuable is the Kaufmann codex of the Mishnah, the recently published reproduction of which forms the main subject of this review.

This codex, while closely related to the Cambridge manuscript, is vastly superior to it because of the fact that it is preserved almost in its entirety; moreover, it is beautifully executed, and is fully vocalized throughout. The present writer published, as early as 1907 (in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*), a detailed account of the character and value of this codex; it has been generally recognized ever since as the most trustworthy source for the restoration of the original Mishnic text, a task in which both Jewish and Christian scholars are equally interested. In fact, we are indebted to Christian scholars for all the photographic reproductions of Mishnic and Talmudic manuscripts hitherto published, for Strack and Lowe, as well as the editor of the newly published reproduction of the Kaufmann codex, are not Jews.

The provenance of the Kaufmann codex is shrouded in darkness up to the day when it became the property of the late Dr. David Kaufmann, Professor in the Jewish Theological Seminary at Budapest. A distinguished scholar and an ardent booklover, Dr. Kaufmann had the good luck to be the possessor of a fair-sized fortune, and he spared no effort in obtaining literary treasures. On the day when the Mishnah codex came into his hands (in 1896), after many months of ceaseless effort, hope, anxiety, and sometimes despair, his joy was unbounded. He expressed his feelings in a beautiful Hebrew poem which is reproduced together with the text of the codex; it is a worthy token of his happiness in acquiring

this priceless "vessel", a veritable "store of every delight".

We do not know where the Kaufmann codex originated. The late Professor Ignaz Goldziher was of the opinion that the codex came from South Arabia. The present writer, however, has shown in his account referred to above that the characteristic peculiarities of the codex point rather to Italy as the place of its origin.

On the death of Professor Kaufmann in 1899 his library, including the Mishnah codex, was presented to the Hungarian Academy of Sciences at Budapest. With the Academy's permission it has now been reproduced in facsimile, under the direction of the learned professor of Protestant theology at Heidelberg, Dr. Georg Beer. In a charming dedication Dr. Beer consecrates this capital work to the Hebrew University of Jerusalem as a token of affectionate coöperation between Christian and Jewish scholars. The Dutch firm of Martinus Nijhoff undertook the task of publication, and the establishment of Albert Frisch of Berlin executed all the technical work. The international character of this magnificent publication is further enhanced by the fact that it was made possible by the financial aid of America; for it is only thanks to the generosity of Dr. George Alexander Kohut, of New York, that this great literary event, as I feel fully justified in calling it, was successfully brought to completion.

S. KRAUSS.

Vienna.

History of Dharmaśāstra (Ancient and Mediaeval, Religious and Civil Law). By PANDURANG VAMAN KANE, M.A., LL.M., Advocate. High Court, Bombay (etc.), Vol. I. Poona: BHANDARKAR ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE, 1930.

The author of this very valuable history of Hindu law-literature herewith completes a full dozen of works on Sanskrit history and literature. He has been professor of Sanskrit at Elphinstone College, Bombay, and is now a practicing advocate. The present portly volume of about eight hundred pages gives in approximately chronological order (many dates are doubtful and disputed) a *résumé* of what is known concerning a long series of Hindu law-books (from *circa* 600 B. C. to 1800 A. D. and later), brief discussion of dates and contents of the more important works, and some acute

criticism of the views of Western scholars regarding the many disputable points presented by such a mass of legal material.

As was inevitable, the author begins with an account of Sūtra literature, after a few words as to the meaning of *dharma* (right, law), and in this category mentions twenty-three Sūtra collections, of prose, then continues with Manu's law-book and other Smṛtis (versified legal rules), of which he lists twenty-four, and concludes with a list of some fifty-six commentaries and legal digests, which bring his history down to the end of the eighteenth century, when the lady Lakṣmīdevī, of whom Colebrooke spoke with admiration, endeavored to right feminine wrongs by a latitudinarian interpretation of *bhrātara*s (brothers, as heirs) to include sisters. Unfortunately, her work is here shown to be that of a man, who put forward as the author either his mother or his wife (according to tradition, to console her for the death of a child). Sic transit gloriabunda.

There is no period in this long stretch of legal activity (what other people can show an uninterrupted line of law-books for twenty-four hundred years?) which is not marked by historical difficulties, not only in regard to actual dates but also as to precedence of authors. Only lately the old established position of Gautama as "first of legal authorities" (c. 600 B. C.) has been questioned by Mr. Bhatakrishna Ghose, who ascribes priority to Āpastamba. But our author successfully repudiates this view and, though it still remains questionable whether an allusion to the Greeks can have emanated from so early a period, the general agreement of scholars seems to remain well-founded. And after all, the date is so far uncertain that Gautama may have lived nearer to 400 B. C. and still lead the list. Western students will be glad to have Mr. Kane's estimate of the order in which these earliest legal authorities appear. It does not differ very much from the usual computation, but specialists will notice some points in which the learned and astute author diverges from opinions advanced by Indian and Western scholars within the last few years, especially as to the works of Viṣṇu and Nārada.¹

To those not familiar with the Hindu law-books it may seem preposterous to assign a date of two centuries to one author, even

¹ For convenience, the following list of Mr. Kane's approximate dates is subjoined: Gautama, 600-400 B. C.; Baudhāyana, 500-200 B. C.; Āpastamba, 600-300 B. C.; Viṣṇu, 300-100 B. C.; Yājñavalkya, 100 B. C.-300 A. D.; Nārada, 100-300 A. D.; Br̥haspati, 200-400 A. D.; Kātyāyana, 400-600 A. D.

when one understands that any time between the extremes is the nearest approach possible to the actual date of the authority. The question, however, is more complicated. It implies others: how much is original, what whole sections have been added, how much has the text been interpolated? The native commentator is not very helpful. For example, faced with the problem why a statement in Baudhāyana's law-book contains the words "Baudhāyana says," he explains that some writers refer to themselves in the third person (which may be the case here), or the author's pupil added this remark (which is a guarantee of its authenticity), or "there may have been someone else of the same name" (referred to by the author). This particular law-giver is in Mr. Kane's estimation much older than Bühler supposed and was not, as the same scholar argued, a native of the South. Mr. Kane has a right to his opinion, but it is scarcely more than that. Baudhāyana is one of the most perplexing of the early writers, or rather, the text as we have it is so obviously interpolated and has been so clearly added to that to arrive at any certain decision as to his date or his place in the list is quite impossible. Mr. Kane instances *grhya* and such forms as evidence of antiquity (pre-Pāṇinian); but just such forms occur in the epic and may as well be evidence of carelessness. The usual statement as to Sūtra-makers, that they strive to be as compact as possible, is shown to be incorrect in the case of Baudhāyana, since he "does not aim at brevity."

Apart from the recognized law-books, Mr. Kane devotes considerable space to the Arthaśāstra and to the epic in its relation to Manu's law-book. He takes, as was to be expected, the position that Kāuṭilya lived about 300 B. C. and argues at length, though not convincingly in the reviewer's opinion, against the objections to this view advanced by Western scholars. It seems to be almost a matter of pride with Indian scholars to maintain the antiquity of Cāṇakya (or Viṣṇugupta or Kāuṭilya, a form preferred to Kāuṭalya) and his Arthaśāstra, so adverse are they to admitting the obvious marks of lateness in that remarkable work. Mr. Kane says that Kāuṭilya does not mention the epic and hence is older than the Mahābhārata. But why does not the epic, which treats at length of *arthaśāstra* and mentions a large number of legal authorities, speak of Kāuṭilya? In the reviewer's opinion the Kāuṭilya Arthaśāstra is not so old by centuries as Mr. Kane would have us

believe. Kāuṭilya probably used older *arthaśāstra* material and that is the material referred to by epic writers as *arthaśāstra*, not the work of Cāṇakya.

As to Manu, Mr. Kane, to begin with, does not believe in the existence of Bühler's *Mānavadharmasūtra* at all. Manu, according to our author, is a compilation or redaction of two precedent works, Svāyambhuva's *dharmaśāstra* and Pracetas's *rājadharmā*, both of which existed prior to the fourth century, while our *Manu-smṛti* is a work earlier than the great epic. All this is pure speculation, ingenious but unproved, and not very probable. Fifty years ago the present writer began a paper presented two years later to the Oriental Society (it takes about two years to read the great epic through, annotating it for any special investigation), in which he showed that there was a marked difference between the correspondence of epic verses ascribed to Manu with the *Manu-smṛti*, the earlier books showing far less than the later books. The reason is that the epic writers like those of an older date, were citing in large measure from Manu as a personal authority, not from a *Manu-smṛti*, just as, still earlier, "Manu divided his property" became authoritative. Mr. Kane seems to think that every "Manu said" is a quotation from a book, but the great number of verses ascribed to Manu not only in the epic but elsewhere, when an author wishes to give authority to his words, should show that "Manu said" is no indication that a citation of this sort is genuine, especially since such citation often contradicts the *Manu-smṛti*. Mr. Kane inclines to believe that Western scholars are prejudiced against Manu and wish to demolish his venerable authority as the maker of a law-book. He defines the historical relation by saying that the extant Manu precedes the extant epic. This statement can of course be safe-guarded by pointing out that "extant epic" includes all the latest additions and if that means the latest additions in the K text there will be no dispute about it. But if it means that in general the *Manu-smṛti* was complete as we have it before the composition of the epic (as we have it without its later additions), then the judgment is exceedingly dubious.

The second volume, which it is expected will shortly follow this, will portray the gradual development of legal opinion in respect of various aspects of Hindu law, such as marriage, judicial procedure, actions at law, etc. It is to be hoped that Mr. Kane will

be enabled to carry out this design, despite the precarious condition of his health, to which he alludes in his preface. It is indeed remarkable that so comprehensive a work as is contained in the present volume should have been composed by one not only in poor health but, otherwise, actively employed in the practice of law. Mr. Kane is to be congratulated on what he has already accomplished and the readers of this book will look forward eagerly to the completion of his forthcoming volume; it is sure to be of great historical importance.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

Yale University.

A Handbook of Mohammedan Decorative Arts. By M. S. DIMAND.
New York: THE METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART. 1930.
xxxii + 287 pp.; 169 illustrations; 4 plates in color. \$2.00.

On the title-page of this book the name of Dr. Dimand, Associate Curator in the Department of Decorative Arts, appears alone, but in the preface there is mentioned that of Mr. Joseph Breck, Curator of the same Department, as author of the chapter on Glass and Crystal. The aim of this very valuable work is double, as we learn from the preface, to trace the main outline of the development of Mohammedan decorative art and to give a guide to the large collections of this art in the Metropolitan Museum. This double aim is pursued throughout the work but especially in the second part. All the illustrations have been selected from the material at the Metropolitan Museum, but a great many objects of other museums are described in the text.

After a historical introduction and a sketch discussing ornament, Dr. Dimand treats Mohammedan calligraphy, bookbinding, painting, stone and stucco sculpture, woodwork, ivory, metalwork, ceramics and textiles (these two branches of art constitute a field in which the author is unusually competent), and rugs. In addition there is a European bibliography of Mohammedan art and a chronological table of Mohammedan dynasties. The book is well supplied with illustrations and colored plates artistically reproduced (the work of Max Jaffe, Vienna, it is enough to say).

The name of M. S. Dimand is the best guaranty that the questions of art are discussed seriously and scientifically. Sometimes

he is audacious yet entirely right, as when he speaks about the unauthentic miniatures of Bihzad (pp. 34 and 54). Sometimes he does not wish, unfortunately, to give his opinion, as, for example, in the question of the date of the famous Poldi-Pezzoli rug (p. 238).

The book is precious and contains interesting material. Nevertheless the reviewer can make some few remarks. In the chapter on ceramics our author often uses the names of Rhages, Veramin, Sultanabad, etc., without giving the geographical explanations that are absolutely necessary to general readers. In talking about Gentile Bellini and his work at the Ottoman court in Constantinople, he does not mention the famous portrait of the Sultan Mohammed II by this painter, now preserved in the National Gallery in London. The bibliography is rich and well detailed, but "politically" composed: some important works of Blochet, Sarre, and others are missing, and yet small unauthoritative articles are quoted (which I prefer not to indicate). The chronological table, at the end of the book, also is presented in a very strange style; some important sovereigns are omitted while some insignificant semi-independent princes are mentioned. Finally, an index of names and technical words will be very useful if included in a second edition of this book.

Dr. Dimand's excellent scholarship is concentrated rather upon art than upon Orientalistics. Hence there are some pardonable mistakes in the historical part of his work. What is the necessity for such a qualification as "the Turks, a non-Semitic race" (p. 6)? Again, the Mongols brought into Turkestan and Persia not only "destruction and misery" (p. 7), but also reconstruction and organization (see Th. Barthold's *Turkestan* in the "Gibb Memorial Series"). Selim I never received the right of the caliphate; that is only a legend (p. 9). The Il-khan Ahmed became Moslem personally, and Islam was embraced by the Il-khans officially in 1295 at the time of Ghazan (p. 285).

N. MARTINOVITCH.

New York City.

CORRECTION

“Turkish *Pala* ‘Sword’ and its Derivatives”

Attention is called to the following typographical errors in the article “Turkish *Pala* ‘Sword’ and its Derivatives” on page 260 in the last volume of the Journal: line 7, read “پالیوش”; line 14, read “پالا or پاله.”

G. C. MILES.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The Executive Committee has elected the following persons as corporate members:

Dr. David Graham
Mr. Maurice Piekarski

Miss Ruth C. Wilkins
Miss Martha L. Zecker

We have recently lost by death three more Honorary Members: Prof. Theodor Nöldeke, the great Semitic scholar (died Dec. 23, 1930, in his 95th year); Prof. A. A. Macdonell, of the University of Oxford (died Dec. 28, 1930); and Prof. Heinrich Zimmern, of the University of Leipzig (died Feb. 23, 1931).

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES

The Eighteenth International Congress of Orientalists will be held at Leiden, September 7-12, 1931. The fee qualifying for full membership is twelve florins (or one pound sterling); the fee for associate membership is one-half that sum. Those desiring to become members should send their subscriptions to “Scheurleer en Zoonen’s Bank”, Leiden. All other inquiries and correspondence should be addressed to XVIII. Congrès International des Orientalistes, Secrétariat, Musée Ethnographique, Rapenburg 67/69, Leiden.

THE RECENTLY PUBLISHED OLD PERSIAN INSCRIPTIONS

ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Introduction	189
Transcription	190
Restoration	192
Bibliography and Abbreviations	193
Inscriptions, with commentary.	193
Dar. Sus. 1: The Record of the Building of the Palace at Susa	193
Darius 2-16	212-224
Xerx. Sus. 23, 25, 26	225-226
Dar. II Sus. 5 A, 24	226-227
Art. Sus. 28	228-229
Dar. Ham. b	229
Art. Ham. b	231
Grammatical Summary	232
Concordance and Glossary	234

INTRODUCTION

IN THE FRENCH excavations at Susa, a number of new inscriptions of the Persian kings were found, written as always in the cuneiform syllabary, and mostly in more than one of the three languages: Old Persian, Babylonian, Elamite. These were held awaiting publication—for the first were found in 1898—with the idea that other fragments of the same inscriptions would be found. This expectation was realized, notably in the inscription now known as the "Record of the Building of the Palace"; and finally, in 1929, they were published by V. Scheil, under the title *Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse*.

The inscriptions in Old Persian are twenty-two in number, of which sixteen belong to Darius I, three to Xerxes, two (as I assign them) to Darius II, one to Artaxerxes II. Many of these are too formulaic or too mutilated to add much to our knowledge of OP, but the *Record* (Scheil's No. 1) should at least be bracketed with Darius's inscription at Nakš-i-Rustam for importance of content and for length, yielding only to the Great Inscription of Behistun.

Scheil's volume was followed in 1930 by an article in *BSLP* by



E. Benveniste, who made certain emendations and interpretations, with etymological parallels, almost without exception well chosen. Shortly after this, J. M. Unvala, with the support of the Parsee Panchayet Funds, edited the OP inscriptions with a valuable introduction, a summary of new words and forms, a passage concordance with previously known inscriptions, an English translation, and a glossary with etymological and epexegetical material, but without much original work on the text. Other articles on these inscriptions, except Meillet's brief review in *BSLP* 30. 3. 86-8, have not come to my attention.

Excellent as Scheil's work is, a careful examination of the OP inscriptions has convinced me that more can be done both in restoration and in interpretation. Also, Scheil's sumptuous volume is too expensive and too unhandy for general use by scholars in Iranian, and it has occurred to me that a fairly detailed article, giving credit to the previous treatises, but attempting somewhat more in restoration and in grammatical commentary, would be in place, especially as it could be used as a supplement to the editions of the text by Tolman and by Weissbach.¹ For this reason, after the inscriptions of Susa, the two recently published inscriptions of Hamadan are given.

The high value of Johnson's *Index Verborum* to the older inscriptions is my warrant for including a complete word concordance to these new inscriptions.

Of necessity I have worked from the published reproductions, which are hand drawings, except Scheil's Plates VIII-X of No. 1 and XII of No. 8 and Unwalla's² plate of Dar. Ham. b (silver tablet).

A few passages of inscriptions previously known can now, with the help of these new finds, be more satisfactorily interpreted; all such matters are placed in the footnotes, for greater ease of reference.

TRANSCRIPTION





The transcription here used closely follows that of Tolman, with one exception; but for entire clarity a table of equivalents is given:




¹ Unvala's pamphlet is for several reasons unsatisfactory in this capacity; it is also difficult to secure, as it is not handled commercially by the printer.


² Same as Unvala, but printed Unwalla in his writings on Dar. Ham. b.

	Tolman	Weissbach	Scheil	Meillet
ā	ā	ā	â	ā
i ī	i ī	i	i	i ī
u ū	u ū	u	u	u ū
x	x	k	x	x
c	c	ķ	č	č
j	j	ǵ	ǵ	ǵ̃
θ	θ	t	t	θ
f	f	p	f	f
y	y	i	y	y
v	v	u	v	v
ç	θ ^r	s	ç	ç
h	h	h	h	h

Thus Weissbach and Scheil do not attempt to indicate the length of *i* and *u*, which, it is true, can be determined only on etymological grounds; for the other symbols, except the next to the last in our list, no difference in the sound is indicated by the difference in the notation. The *ç* certainly was a sibilant sound, and the etymological transcription *θ^r* is wrong, for we now have the name *Susa* (twice: *Dar. Sus. 1*, frag. *Eta*; and *Dar. Sus. 14*) beginning with this character. The nasal which is not written in OP before a stop or final has not been inserted by me in the normalized transcription.

The characters have their usual forms, except that the *ta* in *Artaxšaça*, *Art. Sus. 28. 1*, is  instead of , and the *ji* in *jivadiy* in the same inscription is  instead of . The word-divider is the slanting stroke, as in all the inscriptions except those of Behistun, where it is the angle.

The ideograms I have represented by *XŠ* "king", *BU* "earth", *DAH* "country", *AM* "Ahuramazda", which is Tolman's system; and the new ideogram  "god" (*Dar. II Sus. 24*, assigned by Scheil to Xerxes) I have represented by *BG*. The ideogram for Ahuramazda has been known in *Art. Sus. a* and *Art. Ham.*, in the form , now found also in *Art. Sus. 28. 3* and *Dar. II Sus. 5A. 2* (if this be properly attributed by me to Darius II), and also twice in *Dar. Sus. 7. 4, 5*, the first occurrence in an inscription of Darius I. A new and more complicated form is found in two inscriptions of Darius, *Sus. 9. 4, 4, 5* and *11. 4*: ; in the

second occurrence in No. 9 it has the form . The two occurrences in 9. 4 are successive; apparently the repetition is for honorific purposes.

Scheil's text, notably in No. 1, does not indicate the source of the preserved characters, which in some instances is rather important. I have therefore set off the characters not found on the main copy (or the sole copy, if there be but one) by square brackets, while I have set raised numerals in such a way as to enclose characters found on the secondary copies. Thus in the *Record*, characters on Frag. Beta are identifiable as standing between raised 2's, those on Frag. Gamma between raised 3's, and so on.

Italics are used in three ways:

- (a) in the restored text, to indicate characters not preserved on any copy (this makes a double symbolism, italics and square brackets; but any other arrangement had compensating disadvantages);
- (b) in the critical notes to the texts, to indicate characters so badly mutilated in the original that identification out of context would be quite uncertain or impossible, yet the traces agree with the reading adopted in the text;
- (c) in the commentary, for words and parts of words as linguistic material, and for letters as the names of sounds; that they may be more clearly distinguished from the body of the text.

The word-divider is given in the texts, for diplomatic accuracy, but is not reproduced in the citations in the commentary, except for special reasons. In the critical notes and in the commentary, the transcription may be syllabic, as in *ma-na-a*, or normalized, as in *manā*, whichever seems more advantageous in the particular instance.

RESTORATION

In restoration I have dealt freely with the material at hand, inserting all that seems probable or possible, while admitting the uncertainty (though not the impossibility) of some of the added phrases. That much is wrong, in part or in whole, I freely admit; that I have laid my work open to a certain amount of criticism, I freely admit; but I feel it better to give a reasonable restoration which other scholars may use as a basis for further studies, rather

than to leave a gap which eliminates all meaning from the text. Will my co-workers kindly bear in mind what I have here said, if and when they make any critique of this article?

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND ABBREVIATIONS

The following works are constantly referred to in this study, and are therefore listed here. They are referred to in the text by the author's name only, followed by page or paragraph; except that the initials *APL* and *CS* are added to Tolman, *IV* is added to Johnson, and *AiW* is used for Bartholomae's *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*.

V. Scheil, *Inscriptions des Achéménides à Suse*, in *Ministère de l'Instruction Publique et des Beaux-Arts: Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique de Perse, tome xxi, Mission en Susiane*; Paris, Leroux, 1929.

É. Benveniste, *Persica I: Nouvelles Inscriptions Achéménides*, in *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 30.1. 58-67.

J. M. Unvala, *The Ancient Persian Inscriptions of the Achæmenides found at Susa*; Paris, Presses Universitaires, 1930.

H. C. Tolman, *Ancient Persian Lexicon and Texts*; vol. vi of the *Vanderbilt Oriental Series*; New York, American Book Co., 1908.

H. C. Tolman, *Cuneiform Supplement*; vol. vii of the *Vanderbilt Oriental Series*; New York, American Book Co., 1910.

E. L. Johnson, *Index Verborum to the Old Persian Inscriptions*; supplement to and bound with the preceding.

F. H. Weissbach, *Die Keilinschriften der Achämeniden*; Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1911.

A. Meillet, *Grammaire du Vieux Perse*; Paris, Guilmoto, 1915.

C. Bartholomae, *Altiranisches Wörterbuch*; Strassburg, Trübner, 1904.

INSCRIPTIONS, WITH COMMENTARY

Dar. Sus. 1 Scheil (pp. 3-5, 16-34, with photographic reproductions and line drawings), in several copies; also Bab. and Elam. versions, each in several copies.

This inscription Scheil fittingly terms the "Charte de Fondation du Palais"; I shall for brevity term it the *Record*. Of the three versions, the OP is fortunately the best preserved, though

there are passages where we must depend on the others for the restoration.

Each of the versions was in several copies, some on clay tablets and others on marble plaques. The line divisions and the line lengths of the different copies varied, and there were even some differences in the text of the different copies. Scheil names the fragments of the Bab. version by Roman capital letters, those of the Elam. by Italic minuscules, those of the OP by Greek minuscules; a means of identification which I shall retain, though often writing out the name of the Greek letter in full.

Alpha: a clay tablet 26.5 x 22 cm., found in the palace itself, broken into 12 to 15 pieces; see Scheil's Plates VIII and IX, from a photograph. The obverse bore 27 lines of writing, the lower edge 2, the reverse 28, the top edge 1. In the composite restored text, all characters not preserved on Alpha in whole or in part are cut off by square brackets.

Beta: an irregularly shaped fragment of 18 lines, preserving parts of lines 1-18 of Alpha; see Scheil's Plate x, from photograph. The text of Beta is shown between raised 2's in the composite text.

Gamma: a small fragment with a right-hand edge, showing parts of 8 lines, found in Alpha 3-10 (Scheil says 4-9); Pl. x, from photograph, and drawing, p. 23. The text is given between raised 3's in the composite text.

Delta: a small fragment of 7 lines, the first three of which are in Alpha 13-5 (between raised 4's in the composite text), but the fourth showing a phrase not found in any other preserved copy, and irreconcilable with Alpha. A restoration is therefore given here:

- | | | |
|---|---|----------|
| 3 | [<i>m</i> / <i>XŠyam</i>] akuna[<i>uš</i> / <i>ahyāyā</i> / <i>BUyā</i> / <i>Aura-</i> | cf. α 15 |
| 4 | <i>mazdā</i> / <i>ya</i>]θā kāmā[<i>šim</i> / <i>āha</i> / <i>avaθā</i> / <i>akuna-</i> | |
| 5 | <i>uš</i> / <i>hauv</i> /] māma a[<i>kunauš</i> / <i>XŠyam</i> / <i>haruva-</i> | cf. α 17 |
| 6 | <i>hyāy</i>]ā BUyā [/ <i>utā</i> / <i>martiyānām</i> / <i>Aura-</i> | |
| 7 | <i>mazdā</i>]maiy [<i>aspam</i> / <i>haruvahyāyā</i> / <i>BUyā</i> /] | cf. α 16 |

Badly mutilated characters in italics: 4] θā | kāmā[; 7]maiy.

Most of this is very uncertain; but it might continue from this

point with the wording of the composite version in 16, omitting the phrase in 17 which has been already used.

Epsilon: a fragment of 17 lines, the first without legible character, and the remainder fitting into Alpha 42-56; Scheil, Pl. XI, from a photograph. As the lines of Epsilon are somewhat shorter than those of Alpha, lines 4-7 of the former overrun the ends of the lines of the latter: thus ε 3 is in the early part of α 43, but ε 4 is at the end of α 43 and the beginning of α 44, etc. I have indicated this text between raised 5's.

Zeta: a fragment of 7 lines, fitting into Alpha 38-44 (not 39-45, as Scheil says); Scheil, Pl. XI, from a photograph. It is shown between raised 6's.

Eta: a fragment of 6 lines, fitting with variations into Alpha 50-7 (Scheil 51-7); Scheil, Pl. XI, from a photograph, and p. 23, line drawing. It is shown between raised 7's. The text is a variant version, with lines somewhat longer than those of Alpha, and reverses items 2 and 4 in the list of artisans, 49-55:

- [*tyaiy / daranam / akunavaša / avaiy / Māday-*
 1 *ā / utā /*] *Mud[rāyā / tyaiy / didām / apiy / akunavaša / avaiy*
 2 */ Māda]yā | utā [/ Mudrāyā / martiyā / tyaiy / ištiyā / akunavaša*
 3 */ a]vaiy | Bābiru[vīyā / utā / Yaunā / tyaiy / kāsakaišuv / avaiy / S-*
 4 *pa]rdā | utā | Mu[drāyā / θātiy / Dārayavauš / XŠ / vašnā / Aura-*
 5 *ma]zdāha | Čūšāy[ā / frašam / unidātam / paridištam / akunava-*
 6 *m /] mām | A[uramazdā / pātuv / . . .]*

Badly mutilated characters in italics: 1]*Mud*[; 3]*vaiy* . . .

ru[; 4]*rdā*; 5]*zdāha* | *Čūšāy*[; 6 *A*].

In 4-5, this version was longer by one word than Alpha; but both here and in Alpha the omission of *ima hadiš* is noticeable, and creates doubt of the correctness of the restoration.

Theta: a small fragment of 5 lines, falling in Alpha 49-56 (Scheil 49-57); drawing in Scheil's Pl. XI. The text is shown between raised 8's in the restored text. But Theta had very long lines, and the phrasing in the last lines was different, probably including the *ima hadiš* which we miss in Alpha and Eta. The following restoration is suggested:

- 49 *martiyā / ni*]y | ka[rā / *tyaiy / daranam / akunavaša / avaiy /*
Mādayā / utā / Mudrāyā / tyaiy / kāsakai-
 51 *šuv / ak*]unavaša [/ *avaiy / Spardā / utā / Mudrāyā / martiyā*
/ tyaiy / ištīyā / akunavaša / avaiy /
 53 *Bābir*]uviyā [/ *utā / Yaunā / tyaiy / didām / apiy / avaiy /*
Mādayā / utā / Mudrāyā / θātiy / Dārayavauš
 55 / *XŠ / va*]šnā [/ *Auramazdāha / ima / hadiš / tya / Čūšāyā /*
adam / akunavam / unidātam / paridiš-
 56 *tam /*] fraša[m . . .

Badly mutilated characters in italics: 53]u*vaiy*[; 55]šnā;
 56 fraša[.

Iota: a fragment in two pieces, which fit closely together, although Scheil gives one on Pl. XI and the other, marked merely 1-7, on p. 23; line drawings only. They show 7 lines, fitting into lines 1-7 of the restoration; the reverse gives a brief fragment of two lines, fitting into 57-8 of the restoration. The piece on Pl. XI has a right-hand edge. This text is shown between raised 9's.

Fragment indicated by Scheil with a question mark only, and perhaps not belonging here; 5 lines, in drawing, p. 23:

- | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 |]da-a-[| |
| 2 | A]u-ra-ma-[za-da-a- | The badly mutilated characters |
| 3 |]ya-ma na-i-[ya | are here shown in italics in the |
| 4 |]ā ka-ša-[| preserved text. |
| 5 |]ma-na-i-[| |

The *Record* is fittingly divided by Scheil, p. 4, into seven sections:

- § 1. Homage to Ahuramazda, lines 1-5.
- § 2. Name and titles of Darius, lines 5-8.
- § 3. Darius's call to royal power, and his general activities, lines 8-21.
- § 4. Foundation of the palace at Susa, lines 21-27.
- § 5. The building materials and their provenance, lines 28-49.
- § 6. The nationality of the workers at Susa, lines 49-55.
- § 7. Summary, with prayer to Ahuramazda, lines 55-58.

1-12: Formulaic text, showing no variations not already known.

1 [b]ūmīm: Enough of the *u* is left in *Iota* to show that the word was written out, although the ideogram was used in every other occurrence.

12-14: A new historical fact is here revealed, that Darius's father and grandfather were both living when he ascended the throne.

13 [ni]yāka: there is a double error in Scheil's [apan]yāka, for it means not "grandfather" but "grandfather's grandfather", like Latin *ab-avus*, and the proper word is *niyāka*, written *na-i-ya-a-ka*. In Art. Sus. a 3 we find *apanyāka*, with omission of the *i* character; but the orthography of the inscriptions of Artaxerxes is notoriously bad. In the same inscription [nyā]kam is preserved only in part.

14 [avaθā]: The unfilled gap in Scheil's text calls for a correlative to *yadiy* "when"; there is just space for *avaθā* "then", which is virtually certain. For this correlation, cf. the familiar phrasing in Bh. 1.42-3: *Garmaḍapadahya māhyā IX raucabiš θakatā āha avaθā xšaṇam agarbāyatā*, and the use of *yadiy* (only once in this idiom) in Bh. 1.37-8: *Viyaznahya māhyā XIV raucabiš θakatā āha yadiy udapatatā*.

14 *ubā*: "both", a new word in OP, but a precise equivalent of Skt. *ubhā(u)*, as well as of the Avestan cognate (*AiW* 399-400), where phonetic and orthographic changes obscure the identity of the word.

14 *ajivatam*: third person dual, imperfect indicative, with the ending *-tam* as in Avestan, while Skt. reserves this ending for the second person. Iranian makes here no distinction between the second and the third persons; cf. Reichelt, *Awest. Elementarbuch*, § 255.

Ubā and *ajivatam* are the first dual forms to be found in OP.

16: There is here a new formula; it is assured by the occurrence of *ANŠU-KUR-RA* 'horses' in the Elamite version, end of line 10.³

16 *ha]*ruvahyā[yā: as in Dar. Sus. 8.8; and the equivalent *gab-bi* "all" is preserved in the Bab., line 12. Scheil's *h]*uvhyāy[ā "of this", is impossible in form and in meaning; Unvala, p. 20, thinks it an error for *ahyāyā*; Benveniste, p. 66, has the correct solution, and notes that the word is formed like *ahyāyā* and

³ To Professor E. A. Speiser and Dr. C. H. Gordon, of the Department of Semitic Languages of the University of Pennsylvania, now at the American School of Oriental Research in Baghdad, I make grateful acknowledgment of their generous help with, and careful verification of, all matters pertaining to the Babylonian and the Elamite versions, and to Professor Speiser for confirmation of my use of archaeological data.

- 1 [*baga* / *vazarka* / *A²uramaz²d*]ā | *hya* | *im*[ā]*m* [/ *b⁹ū*]*mim⁹* [/ *a*-
2 *dā* / *hya* / *avam* ² | *asmā²nam*] | *adā* | *hya* | ⁹*ma*[*rt*]*iya⁹m* | *ad*[ā
3 / *hya* / *šiyā²tim* | *ad²ā* /] *mart⁹iyah³yā⁹* | ³ *hya* | *Dāra*-
4 [*yavau^m* / *XŠ²yam* | *akuna²uš* / *a⁹ivam*] | *pa³r⁹ū³nām* | *XŠ*-
5 [*yam* / *ai²vam* | *parūnām* | ² *framā⁹tā*] *ra³m* | *a³⁹dam* | *Dāra*-
6 [*yavauš* / ²*XŠ* | *vazarka* | *XŠ* | *XŠy²*] *ānā³⁹m* | *XŠ* | *DAH³⁹nām* | *XŠ*
7 [/ *ahyāyā²* | *BUyā* |] *Višt*[ā]²*spah³yā⁹* | *pu⁹*[*ça*] | *Haxāma*-
8 [*nīšiya* /] ²*ḁātiy* | *Dāra*[*ya*]*vauš²* | ³ | *XŠ* | [*Au³ra*]*mazdā* |
9 [*hya* /] *maḁišta* | ²*bagān*[ā*m*] | *hau³v* | *m²ā*[*m*] | ³ *adā* | *ha*-
10 [*uv* /] *mām* | *XŠ²yam* | *akunauš* | *hau*[³*ma²i³y* / *i*]*ma* | *xša*-
11 [*çam* / *f*]*rābara* | *t²ya* | [*va*]*zarkam* | *t*[*ya* | *uva²spa*]*m* | *uma*-
12 [*rti*]*yam* | *vašnā* | *Au²ramazdāha* | *hya* | [*ma²nā* /] *pitā*
13 [/ *Viš*] *tās⁴pa* | ⁴ *utā* | [*A*]*r²šāma* | *hya* | *ma*[*nā²* / *nī*]*yāka* |
14 [*avaḁā* /] ⁴*ubā* | *a⁴jīvatam* | *ya²diy* [| *Aurama²zd*] *ā* | *mā*-
15 [*m* / *XŠyam* ⁴] | *akuna⁴uš* | *ah²yāyā* | *BUy*[*ā²* / *Au*]*ramazd*-
16 [*āmai^y* / *aspa^m* / *ha*]*r²uva*[*h*]*y*[*ā²yā* / *BUyā* / *ut*] *ā* | *mar*-
17 [*tiyam* / *adā* / *mā*]*m* ²[] | *XŠ*[*yam²* / *akunauš* / *Auramazdā*-
18 *mai^y* / *upast*] *ām* [/ *frābara* / *Auramaz²dām²* / *adam* / *ayada*-
19 *iy* / *Auramazdā* / *hya* / *maḁišta* / *bagānām* / *tyamai^y* /
20 *aḁaha* / *cartanai^y* / *ava* / *visam* / *dastāmai^y* / *kartam* /
21 *ava* / *visam* / *Auramazdā* / *akunauš* / *vašnā* / *Au*-
22 *ramazdāha* / *i*]*ma* | *ha*[*dīš* / *akunavam* / *tya* / *Čūšāy*-
23 *ā* / *akari*]*y* | *dūradaša* [/ *yūtā* / *idā* / *arjanam* /] *f*[*rābar*-
24 *iy* /] *BU* | *akaniy* | *yātā* | *a*[*ḁagam* / *BUyā* / *a*]*vārasa*[*m* |
25 *yaḁ*] *ā* | *katam* | *abava* | *pasāva* | [*ḁikā* / *akan*]*iy* | *aniy*[*ā* /
26 *4*] *0* | *arašnīš* | *baršnā* | *an*[*iy*] *ā* | [*20* /] *arašnīš* | *bar*[*š*]-
27 *nā* | *u*[*pa*]*riy* | *avām* | *ḁikām* | *hadiš* | *frāsah*[*y*]
28 | *utā* | *tya* | *BU* | *akaniy* | *fravata* | *utā* | *tya* | *ḁikā* |
29 *akaniy* | *utā* | *tya* | *ištiš* | *ajaniy* | *kāra* | *hya* | *Bā*-

Badly mutilated characters in italics:

- α 1 *im*[*a*]*m* | [*bu*]*mim*; 2 *ma*[*rt*]*iyam*: 3 *martiyahyā*: 6] *ānām* |
XŠ | *DAHnām*; 7 *Višt*[*a*]*spahyā* | *pu*[; 8 *ḁātiy* . . . *XŠ* |
[*Aura*]*mazdā*; 9 *maḁišta* . . . *hauv* / *mā*[*m*] | *adā*; 10 *mām*
. . . *akunauš* | *hau*[; 11] *zarkam* . . . *m* | *uma*-; 12] *yam*
. . . *Aurama*- . . . *hya*; 13] *tās**pa* . . . *hya* / *ma*[; 14 *a**jī*-
vatam | *yadiy*; 15 *akunauš* | *ahyāyā* / *BUy*[; 16] *ruva*[*h*]-
y[. . .] *ā* | *mar*-; 17] *m* [] *XŠ*; 23] *y* | *dūradaša*; 24 *BU* |

1 A great god is Ahuramazda, who created this earth,
 2 who created yonder firmament, who created man,
 3 who created welfare for man, who
 4 made Darius king, one king of many,
 5 one lord of many.—I am Darius,
 6 great king, king of kings, king of countries, king
 7 of this earth, son of Hystaspes, the Achæme-
 8 nian.—Says Darius the king: Ahuramazda
 9 the greatest of gods, he created me; he
 10 made me king; he to me this kingdom
 11 granted, the great (kingdom), with good horses, with
 12 good men. By the grace of Ahuramazda my father
 13 Hystaspes and Arsames my grandfather
 14 then both were living when Ahuramazda
 15 made me king of this earth. Ahuramazda
 16 created for me the horse on the whole earth, and
 17 man; he made me king. Ahuramazda
 18 granted me aid, Ahuramazda I revered,
 19 Ahuramazda the greatest of gods—what he told me
 20 to do, all that by my hand was done,
 21 all that Ahuramazda did.—By the grace of Ahu-
 22 ramazda this palace I made which at Susa
 23 was made. From afar to here its ornamentation was brought.
 24 The earth was dug until I came to rock-bottom.
 25 When the excavation was made, then rubble was filled in, one
 26 part 40 feet in depth, the other 20 feet in depth.
 27 On this rubble the palace was constructed.—
 28 And that the earth was dug down, and that rubble
 29 was filled in and that brick was moulded, the Babylo-

akaniy . . .]vārasa[; 25]iṣ | aniy[; 26 an[iy]ā . . . araš-
 nīš | bar[; 27 u[pa]riy . . . šikām; 28 fravata.

β 1]uramaz[; 10]yam | aku . . . ; 11 uva[; 14 Aurama[;
 15]yāyā; 18]dām[.

γ 3]yā / [; 6]m |; 9]v; 10]mai[.

δ 13]pa; 14 ubā.

ι 3]iyahyā; 4]ivam; 5]tāram; 7]a | pu[.

- 30 [b]iruviya | hauv | akunauš | ʃaramiš | hya | nau-
 31 [r]ina | hauv | Labanāna | nāma | kaufa | hacā | avanā | aba-
 32 [r]iy | kāra | hya | Aḍuriya | haudim | abara | yātā |
 33 Bābi[ra]uv | hacā | [Bāb]irauv | Karkā | utā | Yau-
 34 n[ā / abara / yātā / Čūsā]yā | yakā | hacā | Gadārā
 35 | a[bari]y | utā [/ hacā / Ka]rmānā | daraniyam | hacā
 36 | S[par]dā | utā | hacā | Bāxtriyā | abariy | tya
 37 [/ i]d[ā] | akariy | kāsaka | hya | kapautaka | utā | sikaba-
 38 [+]uda [/] hya | idā | karta | hauv | hacā | Sugu^dēā | aba-
 39 riy | kāsaka | hya | axšaina | hauv | hac^a | Uvāra^z-
 40 miyā | abariy | hya | idā | karta | ar^edatam | utā^e | a-
 41 sada | dāruva | hacā | Mudrāyā | ^abariy | a^er-
 42 jana[m] | tya^{nā} | didā [/ p]ištā | ava ^e | hacā | Ya^eun-
 43 ā [/ a]^abariy^s | piruš [| h]ya | idā | ka^rta | ^e hacā | Ku^sš-
 44 [ā] | ut^a | hacā | Hidauv | utā ^e | ha^{cā} | Harau^vat-
 45 [iy]ā^s | abariy | stūnā | aḍagainiya | tyā ^s | id-
 46 [ā] | kar^stā | Abirāduš | nāma | āva[ha]nam | ^sUjaiy |
 47 [| ha]^{cā} | avadaša | abariy | martiyā | kar^snuvakā | t^s-
 48 [yaiy] | avadā | akunavatā | avaiy | Yau^{nā} | utā^s
 49 [/ Spardā / martiyā] | ni^syka^rā | tyaiy | ^s darana-
 50 [m / akunavaša / avaiy Māda[y^sā] | utā | ^rM^sud^rrāy-
 51 [ā / tyaiy / kāsakaiš]u^v | a[k^su]na^svaša^s | avaiy |
 52 [Spa^rrdā | utā | Mu^rd]r^sāyā | ma[rt^si]yā | tyaiy [/
 53 ištīyā / akunava]^sša | a^rvaiy^s | Bā[bir^su^r]viy^s[ā
 54 / utā / Yaunā / tyaiy /] ^sdidām^s | apiy [/ avaiy / Māda-
 55 ^ryā | utā^r / Mudr^sāyā^s] | ʃāt[i]y | Dārāya[vauš / XŠ / va^sš-
 56 nā^s | Aurama^rzdāha ^s[^r ^fra]ša^sm | [unid]ātām | par[idištām / a-
 57 kunavam / ^rmām | A^ru]rama[zdā] | pātuv [/ utā / tya^amai^ay
 58 / kartam / utā / tya /] manā | pitā | uta[mai^ay | DAHu^am]

Badly mutilated characters in italics:

- a 30 [i-; 31 [i-; 32 [i- . . . Aḍuriya; 33 Bābi[ra]uv . . .]-
 irauv; 34 a[bari]y | utā . . .]rmānā; 36 [dā . . . hacā;
 37 i]d[ā . . . kapau-; 38]uda [|] hya; 39 riy; 40 miyā;
 41 dāruva . . . Mudrāyā; 43 [bari]y; 44 [utā . . . Hidauv;
 45 [ā . . . stūnā; 46 kartā; 47 [cā . . . martiyā; 48 avaθā /
 akunavatā | avaiy; 49] / niykarā; 50 Māday[. . . utā;
 51 [navaša; 52]rāyā . . .]ā; 53 [viy[; 54 didām; 55 ʃāt-
 [i]y | Dārāya[; 56 par[; 57 pātuv; 58 manā | pitā.

30 nian folk, it did (that). The timber cedar,
 31 this—a mountain named Lebanon—from there was
 32 brought; the Assyrian folk, it brought it to
 33 Babylon; from Babylon the Karkians and Ionians
 34 brought it to Susa. The oak from Gandara
 35 was brought and from Carmania. The gold from
 36 Sardis and from Bactria was brought, which
 37 was wrought here. The stone—lapis lazuli and ser-
 38 pentine—which was wrought here, this from Sogdiana
 39 was brought. The stone hematite, this from Choras-
 40 mia was brought, which was wrought here. The silver and
 41 the copper from Egypt were brought. The ornamentation
 42 with which the wall was adorned, that from Ionia
 43 was brought. The ivory, which was brought here, from
 44 Ethiopia and from India and from Arachosia
 45 was brought. The stone pillars which here
 46 were wrought—a place named Abirāduš in Uja—
 47 from there were brought; the stone-masons who
 48 there worked, those were Ionians and
 49 Sardians.—The artisans who the struc-
 50 ture wrought, those were Medes and Egyptians;
 51 those who worked on the fine stones, those
 52 were Sardians and Egyptians. The men who
 53 worked on the brick(work), those were Babylonians
 54 and Ionians; those who (worked) at the wall, those were
 55 Medes and Egyptians.—Says Darius the king: by the grace
 56 of Ahuramazda (this) fine well-laid well-walled (palace)
 57 I made. Me may Ahuramazda protect, and what by me was
 58 done, and what my father (has done), and my country.

€ 4 = 43-4]šā; 5 = 44-5]va-; 8 = 47 t[; 10 = 49]ā; 11 = 50
]ā . . . M[; 13 = 52]āyā | mart[; 14 = 53 -y[; 15 = 54
]dīdām; 16 = 55]āyā[.

ζ 1 = 38]d[; 2 = 39]ā | uvāra[; 3 = 40]datam | utā[; 4 =
 41 a[.

η 1 = 50]Mud[; 3 = 53]vaiy; 4 = 52]rdā; 5 = 56]zdāha |
 Qūšāy[.

θ 1 = 49]y | ka[; 2 = 51]unavaša[; 3 = 53]uviy[; 4 = 55-6
]šnā; 5 = 56]fraša[.

ι 1 = 57]mai[.

hamahyāyā, feminine genitives on a stem extracted from the masculine genitive.

17-21: Except for a few characters in 17 and 18, the OP has here been entirely lost. The Bab. version is, however, fairly complete, and shows that these lines consisted essentially of formulas; I give Scheil's translation: "(depuis lors,) moi, d'Ahuramazdâ (14) j'accomplis le service. Ahuramazdâ est mon puissant soutien et ce qu'il m'ordonne (15) de faire est acquitté et réalisé par ma main; tout ce que je fais, (16) je fais par la protection d'Ahuramazdâ." In filling up the gap with OP phrases, I have felt merely that it is better to give continuity to the text at the risk of being criticized, than to leave the break in the sense, when the approximate phrasing is within our grasp. Curiously, after this restoration had been made, a slight confirmation of it at one point was found in Dar. Sus. 12 a⁶, q. v.

21-3: The Bab. suggests the phrasing here adopted.

22 [*i*]ma ha[*diš*]: not [*im*]am ha[*diš*], with Scheil, since *hadiš* is neuter, and the neuter demonstrative is *ima*.

23: The order is changed from Scheil's, to agree with the Bab.; and the text fills the space, now that *yātā idā* has been inserted.

23 *dūradaša*: for Scheil's *durdaš*, Unvala's *durdaša*. This adverb is a new form, from *dūra*- "far", known in the adverb *dūrai*y, Av. *dūire*, (abl.) *dūrat*, Skt. *dūra*-; the adverb *dūradā* "far off" is made like OP *avaḍā*, *idā*, Skt. *iha*, *kuha*, and has taken the ablative -*ša* ⁴ like *avaḍaša*, to give the "from" idea. *Dūradaša* might have been preceded by *hacā* "from", cf. *hacā avadaša* 47 inf., and Bh. 1. 37, 3. 42, 3. 80, but is not, for the *ya* which ends the preceding word is legible, though mutilated.

⁴ I take this -*ša* as abl. to the pronominal stem seen in -*šaiy*, -*šim*, -*šām*, -*šiš*, cf. abl. -*ma*; and therefore do not, with Meillet, p. 180, and Benveniste, BSLP 31. 2. 64-5, take -*šim* Bh. 1. 50 as ablative in use because the abl. of this stem had disappeared from the language. I still hold to my interpretation, JAOS 35. 336-43 and *Textual Criticism of Inscriptions*, p. 11, of Bh. 1. 50-1 *kārašim hacā da-ra-ša-ma atarsa* as haplographic for *kārašim hacā dr(augā dar)šam atarsa* "the people feared him exceedingly on account of the lie". Benveniste's résumé of my arguments is eminently fair; but he takes -*šim* as abl. depending on *hacā* and denies the meaning "on account of" to *hacā*, though the union of the meanings "from, out of" and "on account of" is a common semantic development, cf. Latin *ex*, Greek *ἐξ*, German *aus*, etc.

23 [*arjanam*]: from 41-2; so Scheil, misprinting *arjānam* in his text.

23-4 *f[rābariy]*: just filling the gap; for Scheil's *fra* . . .

24 *akaniy*: reading certain, here and again in 28 and in 29; though Dar. Sz. c 10 has *akāniy*, to which Unvala wrongly emends all occurrences in the present inscription.

24 *a[θagam BUyā]*: my suggestion, "stone of the earth" = "rock bottom", after line 18 of the Bab. *a-di qa-q-a-ri du-un-ni-šu* "to the earth its strengthening", in the same meaning. *Aθaga-* is the regular equivalent of Av. *asənga-* "stone" (*AiW* 210), and gives the derivative *aθagaina-* in OP.

24 [*a*]*vārasa[m]*: "I went down to", *ava* + *arasam*, a new combination, but both parts already known in OP; so with Benveniste, p. 67, for Scheil's [. . *u*]*vārasa[m]*. The first person is justified by the Bab. *ak-[šu]-du* "I reached", line 18.

25 [*yaθ*]*ā*: so with Benveniste, p. 67, for Scheil's [*ut*]*ā*; corresponding to the Bab. *ar-ki ša* "after" (line 18), and correlative to the following *pasāva*.

25 *katam*: a new word, participle of *kan-* "dig" = Av. *kata-* "Kammer, Vorratskammer, Keller" (*AiW* 431), NP *kad* "house".

25 [*θikā akan*]*iy*: restored by Scheil after 28-9. *θikā* is a new word, corresponding to Bab. *hi-iš-ši* with the determinative *aban* "stone"; Scheil takes as broken stone (cf. *ḥašāṣu* "break into pieces"), on which the foundations of the palace should be laid. Benveniste, pp. 60-1, gives a number of possible cognates in Skt. and Iranian, notably Skt. *sikatā* "sand, gravel", with irregular correspondence in the initial sibilants (perhaps Prakrit *s* for Skt. *ṣ* in *sikatā*), and hesitatingly suggests that *Sika[ya]uvatīś* Bh. 1. 58 is a fem. adj., to **sikayah-vant-* "sandy, gravelly".

akaniy here and in 29 must mean "was filled in", a meaning which (despite Scheil ad loc.) is normally not had by the primitive, but only by certain compounds (*AiW* 437-8).

25 *aniy[ā]* and 26 *an[iy]ā*: probably nominatives in partial apposition with *θikā*, "the one part of" and "the other part of"; cf. Bh. 1. 86-7.

26: The numerals are restored from the other versions.

26 *arašnīš*: "ells, cubits", beyond doubt, since the Bab. equivalent *ammati* is preserved. Scheil compares Av. *arəθna-*, *frārəθni-* (*AiW* 196, 1021), Skt. *aratnāy-* "cubit". Benveniste, p. 58,

notes that the word proves OP *šn* as the product of Iran. *θn*, from earlier *tn*, a process already proposed by P. Tedesco, *BSLP* 26. 164; so also Meillet, *BSLP* 30. 3. 87. This word seems to be an acc. pl., the only distinctive acc. pl. outside the pronouns of the third person (cf. Kent, *JAOS* 35. 336, n. 2); unless indeed it is an instr. pl., cf. the use of the instr. with plural numerals in Bh. 1. 42, etc. (Johnson, *IV* 42 *raucabiš*), and the instrumentals in *-iš* given by Reichelt, *Awest. Elmb.* (§ 359 *γžara-γžarantiš*, § 362 *nāmaniš*, *ašaonīš*, § 364 *yātūš* for *-viš*, *varuhīš*).

The depth of the gravel or rubble filling on which the palace was built may seem astonishing, but the excavators actually found that it ranged from a maximum of 12 meters in depth to a minimum of 30 cm. (Pillet, *Le Palais de Darius*, p. 44, quoted by Scheil, p. 26). If the cubit in the text is the unit which Scheil takes it to be, it is rather the Bab. foot of 343 mm., giving depths of 13.72 m to 6.86 m. for the broken stone, which, though too much for the minimum, is not far from the truth for the maximum.

26 *ba-ra-ša-na-a*: cf. Av. *baršnav*- "Erhebung, Höhe, culmen" (*AIW* 951); but not to be normalized *barašnā*, with Scheil, for the *a* of the Av. is only anaptyctic; cf. Skt. *br̥hati* "magna", impv. *barhaya*. Better *baršnā*: the voicelessness and palatalization of the sibilant shows that it was in contact with the nasal.

27 *frāsaḥ*[y]: to be taken with Benveniste, pp. 66-7, as a denominative verb, to Av. *asah*- "Ort, Stätte, Platz, Raum" (*AIW* 209), with prefix *fra*.

28 *fravata*: a new adverb, "downward"; Benveniste, p. 59, compares Phl. *frōd*, NP *farō(d)*, Skt. *pravatā* "downhill". But *fravata* has as its final not the instr. ending as in the Skt. word, but the *-tas* ending, as in *amata* Dar. Ham. b 5: for the *-va-*, cf. the citations in E. Boisacq, *Dict. étym. de la langue grecque*, s. v. *πρωτος*. Unvala's emendation to *fravatā* is unjustified.

28-9 *tya*: occurring three times, in the sense of Latin *quod* "the fact that", introducing an object clause of fact.

29 *ištiš*: "brick", in the collective sense; cf. Av. *ištya*- "Ziegel, Backstein", *zamoīštvā*- "Lehmziegel" (*AIW* 378, 1691), Skt. *iṣṭakā*- "brick",⁵ and NP *xišt*.

29 *ajaniy*: a new form, "was struck, moulded", appropriate of bricks; as Scheil notes.

⁵ [There is also a Mediaeval Sanskrit *iṣṭikā* "brick", for which see note in my forthcoming article in *Language*. W. N. B.]

29-30 *Bā[b]iruvīya*: Scheil wrongly normalizes without the final *a*.

30 *θaramiš*: a generic word for "wood"; but Scheil's effort to connect it with Av. *dārav*- "Baumstamm, Holz, Holzstück" (*AiW* 738) fails, because the initial consonants are not reconcilable.

30-1 *nau[r]ina*: the specific name of the wood, which is identified as "cedar" by *iš erinu* in line 21 of the Bab. Scheil, p. 27, suggests that *θaramiš hya naurina* means "tronc d'arbre de Naharin", Naharin being the West Semitic name for the country north of the upper Euphrates, in which Lebanon is included. If so, we must interpret as *na^hurina*.

31 *Labanāna*: surely "Lebanon"; the Bab. equivalent is *ša-du-u* "mountain", and the cedars of Lebanon have been famous from antiquity. Scheil normalizes *Labnāna*, but I prefer *-ban-*, since *-bn-* is not an OP consonant group.

31 *avanā*: not *avnā*, with Scheil. This new adverb is an ablative formation on the instrumental (not an instr. as abl., as Meillet, *BSLP* 30. 3. 87, takes it; cf. also Benveniste, p. 59). Cf. *anā*, *tyanā*, and abl. *aniyanā*, loc. *yanaiy* (Kent, *JAOS* 35. 338 and n.); for the phrase *hacā avanā*, cf. *hacā avadaša* 47, Bh. 1. 37, 3. 42, 3. 80.

31-2 *aba[r]iy*: occurring several times later, is a new form.

32 *yātā*: here preposition as in Dar. Ham. b, but governing the loc. directly. Scheil is wrong in reading *Babi[ru]v*, which is no form of the paradigm; traces at least of all the letters except the *-ru-* in *ba-a-ba-i-[ra]-u-va* are visible.

33 [*Bāb*] *irauv*: loc. with *hacā*, as in l. 44 and Dar. Ham. b *hacā Hidauv*. Scheil is wrong in reading *]iruv*; *-ra-u-va* is clear and uninjured, with part of the preceding *i*.

33 *Karkā*: Bab. *Kar-sa-a*, name of a people, named also Dar. NRa 30. Their identity is disputed; for theories, see Unvala, pp. 40-1.

33-4: Scheil, pp. 27-8, misinterprets this passage; he restores 34 *n[ā abariy yātā Uvaji]yā*, and translates "Depuis Babylone, Karka et Yauna, il fut apporté chez les Susiens." But with the preserved part of the text, it can mean only, "The Assyrian folk carried it to Babylon, from Babylon the Karkians and Ionians . . ."; and the natural supplement is *abara* "carried". Scheil is, however, disturbed by the apparent reverse order of the transporting parties; he expects the Ionians, if carrying at all, to carry

the cedar from near their own country, and the Assyrians to do a later part of the transport. He therefore reads the three names as countries enumerated in the reverse order of the transport. But the OP idiom in a list is to repeat the *utā* "and" every time, as in 43-4, where there is a list of three, or to omit it entirely; not to use it only between the last two members of the list. Also, the OP repeats the preposition before a second noun, as in 34-5, 35-6, 43-4, and this is not done in 33. The correct interpretation, therefore, is that the Assyrians carried the timber to Babylon, and from Babylon the Karkians and the Ionians carried it to Susa. The presence of Ionians at Susa is guaranteed by line 54, where they receive credit along with the Babylonians for the brickwork of the palace; the passage is in part a restoration, but is certain.

34 [*abara*]: for Scheil's *abariy*; the reasons are in the preceding note.

34 [*Qūšā*]*yā*: while [*Uvaji*]*yā* "the Susians", as Scheil restores it, is possible, the name of Susa itself is found in Fragment Eta 5, and is probably to be restored here: the more so as *yātā* takes the loc. in 33-4, and *Qūšāyā* is loc., while *Uvajiya* is acc.

34 *yakā*: Bab. [*miš*]-*ma-kan-na*, rendered "oak" by Scheil. As *mišmakan* is defined in Babylonian as *išši dāram* "eternal wood" (Langdon, *VAB* 4. 164. 12, 256. 4; *JRAS* 1929. 379, quoted by Scheil), the meaning is quite possible; but Scheil's suggestion of etymological cognation between *yakā* and Gm. *Eiche*, NE *oak* is impossible, since, as Benveniste, p. 61, says, the Germanic words go back to primitive IE **aig-* or **oig-*. Scheil says that the oak grows to-day in North India and in the Himalayas, and that Gandāra, from which the *yakā* is said to have come, is in Eastern Persia, by the Upper Indus; but Benveniste, p. 61, objects to the identification with "oak", because oak was much more easily to be brought from Hyrcania, where according to Strabo, XI C 509, the oak flourished.

35 [*Ka*]*rmānā*: "Carmania", modern Kerman; Scheil suggested this restoration, but did not put it into his text. The other two gaps left by Scheil are easily filled.

35 *daraniyam*: "gold" = Av. *zaranya-*, Skt. *hiranya-*; first occurrence of the word in OP, cf. Benveniste, p. 59. As Scheil notes, the gold came from Sardis, the land of the gold-bearing Pactolus, and from Bactria, which later had the famous gold coinage.

37 *kāsaka*: a general name for "valuable stone" rather than for "precious stone"; Benveniste, p. 61, suggests Skt. *kāca*- "crystal, quartz" as cognate, remarking on the difference in the second consonant. But it is rather a derivative to an Iran. root **kas*- = Skt. *kaç*- "be visible, appear, shine", with a development of meaning somewhat like that of Eng. *brilliant*. Elam. *qa-si-qa* is borrowed from the OP.

36-7 *tya* [i]d[ā] *akariy*: this and similar phrases below show that, as is natural, the more valuable materials were worked up into finished form not in the land of their origin, but at Susa.

37 *ka-pa-u-ta-ka*: not *kaputka*, as Scheil normalizes it, but *kapautaka*, with Benveniste, p. 61, after the incomplete Elam. *qa-ba-u*- in line 31; related to Skt. *kapota*- "pigeon, gray (color of a pigeon)", and giving NP *kabōd* "gray-blue". The Bab. equivalent in 26 is *uk-nû* "lapis lazuli", though Scheil, p. 29, calls attention to the fact that this term is now found to include a number of related varieties of stone.

37-8: *sa-i-ka-ba* + *-u-da*: Bab. *ṣ(i)-ir-qa-ru-u*. Scheil compares *širruššû*, *širmahhu*, the name of a serpent, and interprets as "serpentine", named from its green color with red and white blotches, as in French (whence English borrowed the word).

38 *Sugudā*: the usual incorrect anaptyctic writing; cf. the correct form now found in Dar. Ham. b 5.

39 *axšaina*: the Bab. equivalent in 27, (Sumerian) *KA-G[I-NA]*, means "just word", and Scheil therefore interprets as "hematite", largely used for the cylinder seals. As hematite varies from reddish through brown to black, he compares Av. *axšaēna*- "dunkelfarbig" (*AIW* 51), though he normalizes wrongly *axšina*. Benveniste, p. 61, corrects to *axšaina*, and notes (citing Vasmer) that the same word has come into Greek as name of the Black Sea, **Ἀῖενος*, etymologized and euphemized to *Εἰςῖενος*. Av. *axšaēna*- is from *a* neg. + *xšaina*-, variant of *xšaēta*- "licht, strahlend, glänzend, herrlich" (*AIW* 541).

40 *ardatam*: "silver", Av. *ərəzata*-, Skt. *rajata*-; a new word in OP; cf. Benveniste, pp. 59-60. Scheil remarks that the *Record* says that it was brought from Egypt, but that silver was not found native there, and that the Egyptian language even lacked a special word for silver, calling it "white gold"; that therefore it may really have come from Cyprus, then tributary to Egypt, where it

is found, unless indeed the silver brought from Egypt was booty of war from temples and palaces.

40-1 *a-sa-da da-a-ru-u-va*: thus I read for Scheil's (normalized) *asā dāruva*; for these two words, clearly denoting a second metal because paired with silver, must be noun and modifying adjective, which can hardly be if the prior word is fem. and the second masc. The character in question seems on Scheil's Plate IX rather clearly to have two verticals and not three, and is therefore *da*.

Scheil's suggestion of copper from Cyprus (not from Egypt; cf. note on *ardatam*) seems good; Benveniste, p. 60, suggests "iron" (Phl. *āsin*, NP *āhān*) or even a kind of wood (cf. Av. *dāru*- "tree"), but this last is certainly wrong. Scheil suggests that *asā* (our *asada*!) is a name made from *'asiy*, the Egyptian name of Cyprus. The *dāruva* I would connect with Skt. *dhruva*- "firm, fixed", OP *duruva*- (with anaptyctic vowel), Av. *drva*- "gesund, heil" (*AtW* 782); this yields an appropriate epithet of copper, which is strong and resistant to the elements. Or perhaps "strong copper" means "bronze"; numerous fragments of bronze plates were found in the excavations (Unvala, p. 9 n.).

41-2 *arjana*[*m*]: Bab. *si-im-ma-nu-u*, lines 29 and 17, "decoration", with stucco, enamel, etc. Scheil and Unvala compare Av. *arəj-*, Skt. *arh-* "to be of value", Av. *arəjah-*, Skt. *argha-* "worth, value", and other derivatives of the root.

42 *tyanā*⁶ | *didā* [| *p*]ištā: the correct reading, as Benveniste, pp. 62-3, recognized, for Scheil's syntactically impossible *tyanā*

⁶ The instrumental in *tyanā* cannot here be denied, and justifies Weissbach in seeing an instrumental likewise in Bh. 1.23 *imā dahyāva tyanā manā dātā āpariyāya* "these provinces therefore respected my laws".

The genitive *manā* precedes its noun without article: *manā pitā* Bh. 1.4, Bh. a 5; *manā taumāyā* Bh. 1.9, Bh. a 14-5; *manā dastayā* Bh. 4.35; *manā viṭiyā* Bh. 4.66; *Vištāspa manā pitā* Bh. 2.93; *manā bandaka* Bh. 1.19, 2.19-20, etc. An apparent preceding article may always be taken as a relative: *hya manā pitā* Xerx. Pers. c11, Xerx. Sus. 2, Xerx. Van 18, Dar. Sus. 1.12, 13, Art. Sus. 23.2. An attributive *manā* after its noun is preceded by the article: *kāra hya manā* Bh. 2.25, 27, etc.; *dātam tya manā* Dar. NRa 21. Variations in usage with the following *manā* are seen in *anuṣiyā manā* Bh. 4.82-3, *vašnā Auramazdāhā manacā* Dar. Pers. d9. There is therefore no parallel for *tyanā* as an article, even miswritten, before *manā dātā*; and I withdraw my assumption of dit-tography at this point, made in *JAOS* 40.296 and *Textual Criticism of Inscriptions*, p. 11.

didā[*m*?] *ištā*. The root *pis-* is already known in OP with the prefix *ni*, "cut (an inscription)"; here it has the familiar derived meaning "adorn", as in Greek *ποικίλος*, Latin *pictus*.

43 *piruš*: correctly identified by Scheil as "ivory"; cf. Bab. *pilu*, Elam. *pilu*, NP *pil*; from an Eastern Asiatic group of languages, cf. Przyluski, *BSLP* 27. 3. 220-2, and Scheil, *Rev. d'Assyr.* 24. 120. Scheil notes that *piruš* was brought from just those countries which are the habitat of elephants: Ethiopia, India, Arachosia.⁷ The Persian *r* for *l* shows that the borrowing was an old one; cf. Meillet, p. 72 (cited by Benveniste, p. 62).

43-4 *Kuš[ā]*: Scheil reads *Kuš-* in 43 and [*šā*] in 44, but the space forbids the *š* in 44, and consonants are never written double in OP.

44 *ha-i-da-u-va*: not *Hidāva*, as Scheil normalizes it, for the form is unsuitable, and the penultimate character may be *u* rather more easily than *a*; it is injured, only the bottoms of two verticals being visible. Normalize *Hidauv*, loc. with *hacā*; cf. on *Bābirauv* 33. This is the only word in which *ha* is written before *i* in the value of *hi*, except the incorrect *ahiyāyā* of some inscriptions of Xerxes.

45 *stūnā*: "columns"; cf. Avestan *stūna-* m., *stunā-* f., Skt. *sthūnā-* f. "column", and also MP *stūnā*, NP *sutūn*, in the same meaning. The word, not known until recently, is now found in Dar. II Sus. 5A and 24, and Art. Ham. b, perhaps also in Dar. Sus. 5.

45 *aθagainiya*: nom. pl. fem. of the *i* stem fem., cf. Skt. *balinyas*; Scheil's normalization *aθagainiy* is therefore defective.

46 *Abirāduš*: taken by Scheil to be Aphrodisias in Caria; see his argument, p. 32, and cf. also Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Enc. d. kl. Altwiss.*, 1. 2726 s. v. Carian marble was of high repute in antiquity.

46 *u-ja-i-ya*: not *Ujaiya*, as Scheil has it, but *Ujaiy*. In a naming phrase like this, the locative of the country is demanded; cf. Bh. 2. 22-3 *M[āru]š nāma vardanam Mādaiy*, 2. 44, 2. 53-4, 2. 58-9, 2. 65-6, 2. 71-2, etc. The word must mean "in Uja"; perhaps, as Scheil thinks, this is for Ogygia, but it seems much

⁷ The OP name of the Nile, *Pirāva*, found Dar. Sz. c 9, means accordingly "Ivory River" if it be a derivative singular; or it may be merely a plural of *piruš*, and mean "The Tusks".

abbreviated. Stephanus Byz. cited Ogygia as an old name for Lycia, and Scheil thinks that it was used also for the adjacent districts Caria, Phrygia, Lydia; cf. Scheil's commentary, p. 32.

47 *avadaša*: for Scheil's *avdaš*, Unvala's *avdaša*.

47 *karnuvakā*: for Scheil's *karnuvkā*; Scheil wavers between "Carians" and "sculptors". The former is wrong, because the *martiyā karnuvakā* are said in 48-9 to be Ionians and Sardians (this second name restored after the Elam. 41). It is, however, as Benveniste, p. 66, says, very likely that the word is to be taken in somewhat the second meaning, from the Iran. root *kart-* "cut" = Skt. *kṛt-*. In Avestan there is a present stem *kəṛənv-*: *kəṛənv-* (*ĀiW* 452), which would be OP *karnau-*: *karn(u)v-*; and with retention of the present suffix one might get this *-ka-* derivative, in the meaning "quarrymen, masons, sculptors": probably one set of workers did the entire task of getting out the blocks and shaping them into columns and drums of columns.

49: After [*Spardā*], Scheil restored [*yātā idā abara*], which is rather too long for the gap. More probably [*martiyā*] *niykarā*, a counterpart to *martiyā karnuvakā* 47.

49: *na-i-ya-ka-ra-a*: the first symbol badly mutilated, but probably not *ca* (see Pl. IX and Scheil ap. Benveniste, p. 62 n.), so that Benveniste's *ciyakarā* (cf. Dar. NRa 39, NRb 51) can hardly be right. Fragment Theta has *-ya / ka-*, where the word-divider must indicate merely the separate elements of the compound, as in *ariya / ciça* Dar. NRa 14, *paruv / zanānām* Xerx. Pers. a 8, c 7, Van 12. I propose that the word be normalized *niykarā*, with *-y-* extended from the separate word or from the writing before an initial vowel of compounds, like the *-v-* in *paruvzanānām* Xerx. Pers. b 15-6, d 11. Then, as a derivative of *nī + kar*, the word must mean those who worked at Susa, "putting" the materials "down" into their permanent places, with somewhat the same semantic development as is seen in Latin *condere* and *conditor*. But Unvala's emendation to *-kārā* is unwarranted.

49-55: In these lines Darius enumerates by nationalities the craftsmen who worked at Susa. Scheil, pp. 33-4, gives a clear exposition of the evidence for the meaning, but attempts very little restoration of the text, though a good deal is possible with the aid of the smaller fragments. The work is divided into four parts, each done by craftsmen of two nationalities, as follows (the OP evidence for the ethnics is omitted from this summary):

- (1). Work on the *la-aš-da* (Elam. 42) or *darana-* (OP 49), done by Medes (Bab. 35, Elam. 42) and Egyptians.
- (2). Work on the *is-ma-lu* (Elam. 43) or . . . *u-va* (OP 51), done by Sardians (Bab. 36) and Egyptians (Elam. 44).
- (3). Work on the *a-gur-ru* "baked bricks" (Bab. 38), done by Babylonians (Elam. 45) and Ionians (Bab. 37).
- (4). Work on the *u-šir-tum* "decoration of the walls" (Bab. 39), or *te-iš-ti* (Elam. 46), or *didām apiy* (OP 54), done by Medes (Elam. 46) and Egyptians.

Fragment Eta has the items in the order 1, 4, 3, 2, and Fragment V of the Babylonian has them in the order 1, 4, 2, 3.

There is serious difficulty in determining the nature of some of these activities. The first is fairly clear, for OP *darana-* corresponds to Av. *darəna- darana-* "Befestigung, Aufenthaltsort, Wohnsitz, Schlupfwinkel" (*AtW* 692-3), and seems to mean the structure of the palace as a whole. The third concerns the baked bricks, according to the Babylonian, and therefore has to do with the facing of the walls; the OP must have had some form of *ištiš* (cf. 29) in the text. The fourth was concerned with the "decoration of the walls", according to the Bab., for which we find *didām apiy* "on the wall" in the OP. The greatest difficulty is with the second, where the Elamite word *ismalu* is of unknown meaning; in the OP we find only . . . *u-va*, the second character confirmed by Fragment Epsilon.

The wording is peculiar, in that the only attested verbs in these four items have the form *akunavaša* (complete 51, partial 53), as against *akunavatā* 48, of the stone-masons. Perhaps the change in the verb form may indicate a slight change in the meaning (but cf. Meillet, p. 118), so that instead of "made" the verb may optionally mean "worked at". This interpretation is favored by the phrase *didām apiy* "on the wall", where there is no space for additional words, and by the remnant . . . *uva* in 51, which can be only a neut. acc. sg., or a locative of any stem in the pl. or of an *u* stem in the sg., without the postpositive *-ā*. Now in these four stems we might expect an inclusion of all the materials previously listed:

- (1). *darana-*, including the cedar and oak timber 30 and 34; perhaps also the stone columns 45.
- (3). *ištiš*, the brick, as in 29.

- (4). (the ornamentation) "on the wall", including the *arjanam* 41-2 and the ivory 43.
- (2). the remainder: the gold 35, the fine stones (lapis lazuli, serpentine, hematite) 37 and 39, the silver and the copper 40-1.

I therefore propose *kāsakaišuv*, loc. pl., as a class name to cover these remaining items; and it just fills the gap.

54 *apiy*: seemingly a postpositive preposition, governing *didām*; first occurrence in this use, as all other instances are after *dūrai* (various spellings, see Johnson, IV 6 and 29).^s

55-8: The summary and closing prayer seem to have been shortened because of lack of space; a fuller wording is needed to fill out the line in Fragment Theta, which will include the expected *ima hadiš* "this palace", as well as all that is found in Eta, where part of the name of Susa is read: [*vašnā Aurama*]zdāha *Āšāy[ā]*.

56 *frašam*: cf. Av. *fraša*- "(nach vorn, herzu gewendet, pronus, sva.) geeignet, tauglich" (*AiW* 1006); adj. applying to implied *hadīš*, cf. above on 55-8.

56 [*unīd*]ātām: cf. Av. *hu-ḍāta*- "wohlgebaut" (*AiW* 1824), *nī + dā*- "niedersetzen" (*AiW* 721), *niḍāta*- "niedergelegt" (in cpds., *AiW* 1082).

56 *par[īdīštām]*: ptc. to *pari-* + the root seen in *didā*, Avestan *pairi-daēz-* "ummauern" (*AiW* 673-4); cf. also the miswritten *paradayadām* Art. Sus. 28. 3, with note.

58 [*tya*] *manā pitā*: sc. *akunauš*, "what my father (has done)"; cf. the equivalent phrase *tyamaīy piça kartam* "what has been done by my father", Xerx. Pers. a 19-20, c 13-4, in the second of which *kartam* is omitted.

Dar. Sus. 2 Scheil (pp. 35-6, with line drawing), in one line, on the base of a column; also in Bab. and Elam.

adam | Dārayavauš XŠ | vazarka XŠ XŠyānām | Vištāspahyā | puça
 "I am Darius, great king, king of kings, son of Hystaspes."

The drawing gives the word-divider only where shown above.

^s In Bh. 4. 46 [*ut*]āmaīy is to be read for [*ap*]imaīy; cf. Gray, *AJP* 30. 457.

Dar. Sus. 3 Scheil (p. 37, with line drawing), on the base of a column; also in a Bab. version, mutilated at the ends of the lines.

1 adam [*Dārayavauš* *XŠ* *vazarka* *XŠ* *XŠyānā*]-

2 m *XŠ* *DAH*[*nām* *XŠ* *ahyāyā* *BUyā* *V*]-

3 ištā[*spahyā* *puça* *Haxāmanišiya*]

“I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of countries, king of this earth, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian.”

Badly mutilated character: 3 -a[.

The drawing gives no word-divider in the extant part.

The inscription has the same text as Dar. Kr., Dar. Sus. b, Dar. Sz. b.

Dar. Sus. 4 Scheil (pp. 38-9, with line drawings), parts of two copies on columns; also a nearly complete Elam. version.

1 [*adam* / *Dārayavauš* / *XŠ* / *vaza*]rka *XŠ* *XŠyānā*²m *XŠ* *DAH*²
[*nām* / *XŠ* /

2 *ahyāyā* / *BUyā* / *Vīštās*]pahyā | puç²a | Haxā²ma[*nišiya* / *θātiy*

3 / *Dārayavauš* / *XŠ* / *vaš*]nā [*AMha* /] ²imam [[] *dacara*²m
[*akunavam*]

“I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of countries, king of this earth, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian. Says Darius the king: By the grace of Ahuramazda I made this palace.”

The text of the smaller fragment is shown between raised numerals.

Much mutilated characters in italics: a 2]*pa*-; a 3 *i*-*ma*-*ma* + *da*-*ca*-*ra*-*ma*; b 2 -*a* | *ha*-*xa*-*ā*-, and after a gap perhaps traces of -*na*-*i*; b 3 *i*-*ma*-*ma* | *da*-*ca*-*ra*-.

The drawings give the word-divider as above.

The gap in 3 requires the ideogram for Ahuramazda.

3 *dacaram*: the *da* is certain in copy b, despite the *tacaram* in Dar. Pers. a 6.

Dar. Sus. 5 Scheil (pp. 40-1, with line drawings), parts of two copies on columns; also parts of three Bab. copies.

1 ¹a]dam | *Dāra*¹*yavau*[š / *XŠ* / *vazarka* / *XŠ* / *XŠyānām* / *XŠ*
/ *DAH**nām* / *XŠ* / *ah*]-

- 2 ¹yāyā BU¹yā | V[*istāspāhyā* / *puça* / *Haxāmanišiya* / *θāt*]-
 3 ¹iy | Dāra¹yava[*uš* / *XŠ* / *ima* / *hadiš* / *tya* / *stūnānām* /
akunavam]

“I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of countries, king of this earth, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian. This palace of the columns I made.”

The text of copy *a* is shown between raised numerals.

Much mutilated characters in italics: a 1 -*ra*-[; b 2 *vi*-[.

The restoration follows the Bab. version, which is nearly complete for the parts missing in the OP.

3 [*stūnānām*]: Bab. *ti-im-ma-an*, for *dimmān*, from *dimmu* “column, obelisk”; *stūnā-* is found in Dar. Sus. 1. 45, Dar. II Sus. 5 A, Dar. II Sus. 24. 1, Art. Ham. b.

Dar. Sus. 6 Scheil (pp. 42-3, with line drawing), on a column; also in Elam. version, preserved almost entire.

- 1 ada[*m* / *Dāraya*]vauš XŠ [/ *vazarka* / *XŠ* / *XŠyānām* / *XŠ* /
DAHnām / *XŠ* / *a*-]
 2 hyā[*yā* / *BUyā*]ā | Vištā[*spahyā* / *puça* / *Haxāmanišiya* / *θ*-]
 3 ātiy | Dārayavauš XŠ | y[*aθā* / *Auramazdā* / *mām* / *XŠyam* /
akunauš /]
 4 ahyāyā BUyā | vašnā [/ *Auramazdāha* / *vasiy* / *tya* / *naibam* /
akunavam]

“I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of countries, king of this earth, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian. Says Darius the king: when Ahuramazda had made me king of this earth, by the grace of Ahuramazda I made much that (was) beautiful.”

Much mutilated characters in italics: 2 ha-ya-a-[, -ta-a-[, 3 da-a-ra-, | *ya*[-.

This is Scheil’s restoration after the Elam. version; for the last phrase, cf. Xerx. Van 18-20 *vašnā Auramazdāha vasiy tyā naibam akunauš*.

Dar. Sus. 7 Scheil (pp. 46-7, with line drawing), on a column; also in two Elam. copies, which together are very nearly complete, and in one very incomplete Bab. copy.

- 1 [*adam* / *D*]ārayavauš XŠ | *vazarka* XŠ *XŠyānā*[*m* / *XŠ* /
ahyāyā / *BUyā* / *vazarkāyā* / *Vištāspahy-*

- 2 *a / puça*] | Haxāmanišiya | θātiy | Dā[*rayavauš / Xš / tya /*
adam / akunavam / ahyāyā / BU-
 3 *yā / an*]iyaθā | naiy akunavam | yaθā [/ *AMmai*y / *niyaštāya*
*/ tya / AMmai*y / *niyaštāya / u-*
 4 *tā / mā*]m | AM | dauštā | āha | tya | aku[*navam / vašnā /*
AMhā / ava / visam / akunavam / θā-
 5 *tiy / D*]ārayavauš Xš | vašnā AMhā | hya [/ *tyamai*y / *kartam /*
vainātiy / tyāšaiy / adam /
 6 *BUyā /*] visahyā | frašta | θadayā[*mai*y / *mām / AM / pātuv /*
utamaiy / DAHum]

"I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of this great earth, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian. Says Darius the king: What I did on this earth, I did not otherwise (=precisely) as Ahuramazda commanded me. Because Ahuramazda commanded me and was a friend to me, what I did, all that by the grace of Ahuramazda I did. Says Darius the king: By the grace of Ahuramazda, whoso shall see that (which was) done by me, to him let me seem on the whole earth exalted. May Ahuramazda protect me and my country."

Much mutilated characters in italics: 3 *na-i-ya*, 6 *fa-ra-ša-ta*.

The restorations follow the Elam. version; the ends of 2-5 and the beginnings of 3-4 are here restored for the first time. Scheil thinks that 6 lacked the final prayer found in the Elam.; but there is ample space for it in the line, and it is included above.

1 [*vazarkāyā*]: so with Benveniste, p. 67, for Scheil's slip *vazarka*.

3 [*an*]iyaθā: a new word, to *aniya-* with the ending seen in *avaθā* and *yaθā*; correlative to *yaθā*, though the negative with the verb makes the expression somewhat awkward.

4 [*mā*]m *dauštā āha*: for the idiom, cf. Bh. 4. 55-6, 69, 74.

5 [*hya* . . . *vainātiy*]: for the idiom, cf. Bh. 4. 70.

6: as Benveniste, pp. 63-4, remarks, this phrase, found here and in Scheil's No. 11, makes possible the restoration of Dar. Sus. a.⁹

⁹ The complete text of Dar. Sus. a is therefore as follows:

- 1 [*adam / Dārayavauš / Xš / vazarka / Xš / Xš*]yānām
 2 [/ *Xš / dahyūnām / Viš*]tāspahyā | *puça* | Ha-
 3 [*xāmanišiya / θā*]tiy | Dārayavaus | Xš |
 4 [*vašnā / Auramazdāha / adam /*] *ava* | *akunavam* | *tya*
 5 [*adam / BUyā / visa*]hyā | *frašta* | *θadayāmai*y

I cannot, however, follow Benveniste in rejecting *BUyā* as the word before *visahyā*, since it just fills the gap in all three inscriptions, and offers no difficulty except that *visahyā* must be taken as haplologic for **visahyāyā*; cf. *haruvahyāyā* and *ahyāyā*.

6 *frašta*: apparently a derivative to the stem seen in *frašam*, Dar. Sus. 1. 56, q. v.

Dar. Sus. 8 Scheil (pp. 48-9, with photograph and line drawing); stamped on a brick; unilingual.

1 adam Dārayavau-	5 yānām xšāya-	9 būmiyā Višt-
2 š xšāyaθiya	6 θiya dahyūnā-	10 āspahyā puça
3 vazarka xšāya-	7 m xšāyaθiya	11 Haxāmanišiya
4 θiya xšāyaθi-	8 haruvahyāya	

“I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of countries, king of the whole earth, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian.”

8 *haruvahyāya*: so, with Benveniste, p. 66, for Scheil's incorrect *hruvahyāya*; the final *a*, to make *-yāyā*, is lacking on the brick, as Scheil notes.

9 *Višt-*: without the symbol for *i* after the *vi*.

Dar. Sus. 9 Scheil (p. 51, with line drawing), stamped on a brick; unilingual.

1 adam Dārayavauš [/] XŠ vazarka XŠ XŠy-
2 ānām XŠ DAHnām Vištāspahyā
3 puça Haxāmanišiya θātiy Dā-
4 rayavauš XŠ manā AM AM adam AMm
5 ayadaiy AMmai upastām baratuv

“I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of countries, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian. Says Darius the king: Mine (is) Ahuramazda; Ahuramazda I revered; may Ahuramazda bear aid to me!”

The ideogram for Ahuramazda has here a new form; two parallel horizontals, followed by four parallel horizontals, then four more parallel horizontals, and one vertical; at the second occurrence in 4, the angle also is impressed as last stroke. It has the same form in Dar. Sus. 11. The previously known ideogram, found in Art. Ham. 6 and Art. Sus. a 4, consists of two horizontals, followed by two horizontals, one vertical, and one angle; it is now found also

in Dar. Sus. 7 and Art. Sus. 28 Scheil. Apparently the elaborate symbol was later simplified. The doubling of the symbol in 4 is probably for honorific purposes.

2 *Vīštāspahyā*: written *vi-ša-*, without the *i*.

Dar. Sus. 10 Scheil (p. 51), stamped on a brick; unilingual.

- 1 𐎧𐎠𐎵 | Dārayavauš | x-
- 2 𐎧𐎠𐎵𐎶𐎠𐎶 | vašnā | Aura-
- 3 mazdāha | tya | amaniyai-
- 4 y | kunavānaiy | avamai-
- 5 y | visam | ucāram | āha

“Says Darius the king: By the grace of Ahuramazda, what I thought of (that) I will do, all that was well done by me.”

3-4 *amaniyaiy*: a new form, impf. first sg. mid., with primary ending, of *man-*; the pres. subj. mid., second and third sg., were previously known, cf. Johnson, *IV* 39.

4 *kunavānaiy*: with Benveniste, pp. 64-5, and Meillet, *BSLP* 30.88, pres. subj. mid. first sg., the exact equivalent of Av. *kəranavāne* (Yt. 19.43); here (with Benveniste) depending directly on *amaniyaiy*, as is shown by the position of the correlatives *tya . . . ava*. Cf. the similar use of *xšnāsātiy*, Bh. 1.52.

5 *visam*: with Benveniste, p. 65, for Scheil's *vivam*; cf. *ava visam* in Dar. NRa 49, Xerx. Pers. a 16, b 25-6.

6 *ucāram*: Scheil interprets “une belle oeuvre”, derived from Iran. *hu-*, Skt. *su-* ‘well, good’ + a derivative of the root *kar-* ‘make, do’; Benveniste, p. 65, interprets “bien réussi”, comparing Av. *čāra-*, NP *čār* “means”.¹⁰ For long-vowel formations as the second part of compounds, cf. Av. *tīzi.bāra-*, *sāra-vāra-*, *apa-γžāra-* (*AiW* 1943).

Dar. Sus. 11 Scheil (p. 52, with line drawing), on a brick, unilingual.

- 1 adam | Dārayavauš | XŠ | vazarka | XŠ XŠyān-
- 2 ām | XŠ DAHnām | Vīštāspahyā | puça | Ha-

¹⁰ With Benveniste, pp. 65-6, restore Bh. 4.76 *avataiy Auramazdā uc[ā]ram kunautuv*, according to traces of characters noted by L. W. King and R. C. Thompson, *Sculpt. and Inscr. of Darius*, p. 74, n. 3; instead of Tolman's [ukarta]m, Foy's and Oppert's [vazarka]m.

3 xāmanišya | ʃātiy | Dārayavauš | XŠ
 4 | vašnā | AMha | adam | ava | akunavam | tya |
 5 a[*dam* / *BUyā* / *visa*]hyā | frašta | ʃadayāmai

"I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of countries, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian. Says Darius the king: By the grace of Ahuramazda I brought that about, that I on the whole earth may seem exalted."

1-2: Scheil's drawing shows no word-divider where it is not given in our transcript above.

2 *Vīštāspahyā*: written *vi-ša-*, without the *i*.

2-3 *Haxāmanišya*: written *-ša-ya*, without the *i*.

5 [*BUyā*]: see note on Dar. Sus. 7. 6.

This inscription is virtually identical with Dar. Sus. a.

Dar. Sus. 12 Scheil (pp. 53-5, the two-lined inscriptions in line drawing), on enameled bricks serving as decorations of the palace walls.

These inscriptions were in all three languages, but the finds, though numerous, are mostly very fragmentary, and Scheil has unfortunately given us only a selection. The legends are of two types; those in one line, with characters 5 or 6 cm. high, and those in two lines, with characters 2.5 to 3.0 cm. high. To the former I give the designation a, to the latter the designation b, and I distinguish the fragments by raised numerals.

The average length of the bricks was 35 cm., and each bore about 9 characters per line in the two-lined inscriptions. The text seems to have been taken largely from the *Record*, with a few variants in the merely honorific portions. From fragment b⁴, where the gap between the two lines can be completed from the *Record*, and from a Babylonian fragment (p. 56), Scheil draws the conclusion that each unit of inscription consisted of four bricks; but for the OP it is the missing part of the panel which consisted of four bricks, the unit of inscription consisting of five bricks. Comment on this point will be made under each of the two-lined inscriptions.

a¹ (*Record* 1): . . . b^ū]mi[*m* . . . ; or
 (*Record* 7, 15, 16, 24): . . . b^ū]mi[*yā* . . . ; or
 (*Record* 24, 28): . . . b^ū]mi[*y* . . .

a² (*Record* 2): . . . XŠ /] vazarka [. . .

a³ (*Record* 5-6, 8, 55): . . .] Dārayavauš [. . .

a⁴ (*Record* 7-8): . . . *Haxāmaniš*]iya | šātiy [. . .

a⁵ (*Record* 11): . . . *tya* / *vazar*]kam [/ *tya* / *uvaspam* . . .

a⁶ (*Record* 21): . . . *akunau*]š | vaš[*nā* / *Auramazdāha* . . .

This gives a slight confirmation of my restoration of line 21 of the *Record*, already made before I studied these fragments; for in all the extant OP inscriptions the only instances of the character *ša* ending the word before *vašnā* are Bh. 1. 13 [*pat*]iyāiša *vašnā* and Bh. 1. 18 *pati*[*yāiša*] *vasnā*, a combination which would hardly fit here.

a⁷ (*Record* 22, 34; 56, in *Frag. Eta*): . . . *Āu*]šā[*yā* . . . ; or
(*Record* 43-4): . . . *Ku*]šā[. . .

b¹

[<i>DAHnām</i> / <i>vispa</i>] [<i>ahyāyā</i> / <i>būm</i>]	zanānām XŠ iyā vazarkā-
--	----------------------------------

We have here a panel only two bricks wide, the second of which is preserved entire. It seems to be directly continued by b².

b²

[<i>yā</i> / <i>d</i>]ūrai[<i>y</i> / <i>maθiš</i>]ta [<i>bagā</i>	<i>apiy</i> / <i>Višt-</i> . . . <i>nām</i> . . .]
--	--

The text is restored after Dar. NRa 10-3, Dar. Sz. c 5, Dar. Sus. 15 Scheil; *paruvzanānām* is equally possible instead of *vispazanānām*; cf. citations in Johnson, IV 34 s. v. The whole is a slightly amplified version of the *Record*, 6-9. The gap in b² is long, and contains about 6 bricks, the characters between the two lines of b² amounting to about 57 aside from the lost ones on brick b² itself. This panel had therefore 7 bricks.

b³

[/ <i>ak</i>]unau[<i>š</i> / <i>a</i> / <i>ma</i>]rti[<i>yam</i> / <i>a</i>	<i>hyāyā</i> / <i>BUyā</i> . . . <i>dā</i> . . .]
--	---

The first line comes from the *Record*, 15, and the second from 16-7; the characters in the gap, and not on brick b³, are therefore 43, including two ideograms, or 47 if no ideograms were used: which would fill 5 bricks, making a panel of 6 bricks.

b ⁴	[. . . da]	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td>raniya[m / hacā</td> <td>/ Spardā . . .</td> </tr> <tr> <td> akari[y / kās</td> <td>aka . . .</td> </tr> </table>	raniya[m / hacā	/ Spardā . . .	akari[y / kās	aka . . .
raniya[m / hacā	/ Spardā . . .					
akari[y / kās	aka . . .					
	. . . idā]					

The first line comes from the *Record* 35, and the second line from 37; the characters in the gap, and not on brick b⁴, are 35, making 4 bricks in the gap, and a panel of 5 bricks (not of 4, as Scheil, p. 55, wrongly calculates).

b ⁵	[ar	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td>data]m u[tā / a</td> <td>sada . . .</td> </tr> <tr> <td>m /] tyanā [/ di</td> <td>dā / pištā . . .]</td> </tr> </table>	data]m u[tā / a	sada . . .	m /] tyanā [/ di	dā / pištā . . .]
data]m u[tā / a	sada . . .					
m /] tyanā [/ di	dā / pištā . . .]					
arjana						

The first line comes from the *Record* 40, and the second from 42; the characters in the gap, and not on brick b⁵, are 31, making four full-sized bricks and one half-sized brick in the gap, unless the characters were crowded to make only 4 bricks, or spread to cover 5: a panel of 5½ bricks, or possibly 5 or 6.

b ⁶	[aθagaini	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td>yā] idā [/ kart</td> <td>ā / Abirā . . .</td> </tr> <tr> <td>hacā / a</td> <td>va]daša a[bariy</td> </tr> </table>	yā] idā [/ kart	ā / Abirā . . .	hacā / a	va]daša a[bariy
yā] idā [/ kart	ā / Abirā . . .					
hacā / a	va]daša a[bariy					
		/ martiyā . . .]				

The first line comes from the *Record* 45-6, the second from 47; the characters in the gap, and not on brick b⁶, are 31, making 3 full-sized bricks and one half-sized brick (barring crowded or spread writing): a panel of 4½ bricks.

The panels are accordingly 2, 7, 5, 6, 5½, 4½ bricks in length; it is natural that they should vary to fit the space between the various architectural members—columns, pillars, doorways, angles of any kind.

Dar. Sus. 13 Scheil (p. 58, with line drawing), two lines running vertically downward on the lower part of the robe of a colossal limestone statue; a Bab. fragment and an Elam. fragment may or may not have the same text.

- 1 [θātiy / Dārayavauš / XŠ / tyamaiy / AM /] niyaš[tāya / ava / adam
- 2 / akunavam / AMm / ayadaiy /] AM | Dārayavaum | XŠ[yam / pātuv]

“Says Darius the king: what to me Ahuramazda ordered, that

I did; I revered Ahuramazda; may Ahuramazda protect Darius the king!"

The restoration here given is of course highly problematic, but follows the phrasing of other inscriptions; Scheil makes very limited suggestions. The second line begins with the lower half of an angle, which may be the final stroke of the ideogram for Ahuramazda.

Dar. Sus. 14 Scheil (pp. 59-60, with line drawing), the ends of four lines on a marble plaque broken into two pieces, but perfectly joined; there is a Bab. version, also much damaged.

- 1 [*baga / vazarka / AM / hya / aku*]naš
- 2 [/ *Dārayavaum / XŠyam / θātiy*] | Dā-
- 3 [*rayavauš / XŠ / vašnā / AMha /*] Čūš-
- 4 [*āyā / ima / + + + + + / akuna*]vam

"A great god is Ahuramazda, who made Darius king. Says Darius the king: By the grace of Ahuramazda, at Susa I made this statue."

Badly mutilated character in italics: 4]*vam*.

The restoration is again very problematic; Scheil completes only the words of which portions remain. The Bab. fragment shows that the inscription refers to a marble statue or to the slabs of marble forming the base of the statue.

The OP inscription began with the first line as here given, but it is possible that there were additional lines after line 4.

Dar. Sus. 15 Scheil (pp. 61-5, with line drawing), on a marble slab, the ends of the first 13 lines of the obverse and of the last three lines of the obverse; also, a small part of an Elam. version.

- 1 [*baga / vazarka / Auramazdā /*] hya | i[m]ā-
- 2 [m / *būmim / adā / hya*] | avam | as-
- 3 [*mānam / adā / hya / mar*]tiyam | ad-
- 4 [*ā / hya / šiyātīm /*] adā | mart-
- 5 [*iyahyā / hya / Dārayavaum*] | XŠm | ak-
- 6 [*unauš / aivam / paruvnā*]m | XŠm | a-
- 7 [*ivam / paruvnām / framāt*]āram | a-
- 8 [*dam / Dārayavauš / XŠ / vazarka*] | XŠ | XŠy-

- 9 [ānām / XŠ / DAHnām / vis]pazanā-
 10 [nām / XŠ / ahyāyā / BU]yā | vaza-
 11 [rkāyā / duraiyapiy / Viš]tās-
 12 [pahyā / puça / Hazāmanišiya /] Pār-
 13 [sa / Pārsahyā / puça / Ariya /] Ari-
 14 [ya / ciça / . . .]

On the reverse:

- r1 [mām / Auramazdā / pātu]v | hadā [/ v-
 r2 iθaibiš / bagaibiš / utamaiy /] viðam | u-
 r3 [tā / tyamaiy / nī]pištam

“A great god is Ahuramazda, who created this earth, who created yonder sky, who created man, who created welfare for man, who made Darius king, one king of many, one lord of many. I am Darius, great king, king of kings, king of countries containing all peoples, king of this great earth far and wide, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian, Persian, son of a Persian, Aryan, of Aryan lineage. . . .

“May Ahuramazda with the royal gods protect me and my house and what (has been) inscribed by me!”

The first characters recorded as visible in lines 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 13 of the obverse and in 1 of the reverse are badly mutilated.

As Scheil remarks, the obverse of this inscription is identical with Dar. NRa; but it is uncertain whether the identity extended to the end. An Elamite fragment corresponds to Dar. NRa 16-26; but the reverse of the OP, as found at Susa, seems to be different. Scheil inserts *dipim* in the last line after *tyamaiy*; but *dipim* is a feminine noun, and the preserved *-pištam* can be only masculine or neuter, not feminine. I have therefore omitted *dipim*, especially in view of the wider spacing of the characters in the last line, as compared with those of the preceding line.

Dar. Sus. 16 Scheil (pp. 65-7, with line drawings), several fragmentary inscriptions on marble plaques; restorations and much mutilated letters both in italics:

- 16 A: 1 . . .]a[. . .
 2 . . .] XŠya[. . .
 3 . . . / au]raðaram [/ . . .

3 [*au*]raðaram: Scheil's restoration, which he translates “protégé de Dieu”; presumably the second part from the root in Av.

¹*sar*- "vereinigen" (*AtW* 1563), so that the word would mean "united with, follower of Ahura".

16 B: two fragments belonging to the same plaque:

- 1 . . .]a[. . .
- 2 . . . / *Dārā*]yavauš [/ | u]caš[ma . . .
- 3 . . . / a]dānā |[.]na-sa-ta[. . .
- 4 . . .]m | mā | ka[.] | mā | yā[. . .

For *adānā*, cf. *Bh.* 1. 5; or *na* may be for *ha*, with first angle omitted, when we should have [*Auramaz*]dāhā. Similarly, in *na-sa-ta*, the first character may be *ha*. (These notes from Scheil, p. 65.)

- 16 C: 1 [. . . / *Xš* /] DAHyūnām [/ *Vištāspahyā* / puça /
 2 *Haxāmaniš*]iya | ʔātiy [/ *Dārayavauš* /
 3 *Xš* / *Auramaz*]dām | adam [/ *ayadaiy* / *Auramazdā*
 4 / *mām* / *pātuv*] | utamai[y / *viθam*]

" . . . , king of countries, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian. Says Darius the king: Ahuramazda I revered; may Ahuramazda protect me and my house!"

The restorations, of which Scheil made but part, are problematic, but seem to represent the intent of the inscription.

- 16 D: [*baga* / *vazarka* / *Auramazdā* / *hya* / . . .
 1 / *hya* / *aspam* /] ah-
 2 [*yāyā* / *būmiyā* / *kunautiy* / h]ya | mart-
 3 [*iyam* / *haruvahyāyā* / *būmiyā*] | kunau-
 4 [*tiy* / *hya* / *Dārayavaum* / *Xšyam* / *kuna*]utiy |
 5 [*ahyāyā* / *būmiyā* / *hyamaiy* / *uvaspācā* /] uraθācā |
 6 [*kunautiy* / *adam* / *ayadaiy* / *Auramazdā*]m | mām | Au-
 7 [*ramazdā* / *pātuv* / *utā* / *tyamaiy* /] kartam |

"A great god is Ahuramazda, who . . . , who makes the horse on this earth, who makes man on the whole earth, who makes Darius king of this earth, who makes for me good horses and good wagons. I revered Ahuramazda; may Ahuramazda protect me and what (has been) done by me!"

Scheil restored only the formula in the last line, which gives the length of the lines. The remainder of the restoration is fanciful; but the greater length of lines 5 and 6 is justified because

they show 7 and 8 characters respectively in the preserved part, while the lines 2, 3, 4, 6 show each but 5 characters.

3-4 *kunautiy*: present indicative; a new phrasing for the usual past *akunauš*.

5 [*uvaspā-cā*]: supplied as a counterpart to *uraθā-cā*. The word is already known in OP as an adj.; for use as substantive, cf. OP *ucašma* "(good) eye", to Av. *cašman-*, and Av. *hu-xšnaoθra-* "(good) knee", *hu-paitištāna-* "(good) leg", *hv-apah-* "good deed", *hvira-* "hero" (subst. in Yt. 13.38, according to *AiW* 1858).

5 *uraθā-cā*: "et les bons chars", in Scheil's version; cf. Av. *raθa-* "Wagen" (*AiW* 1506), Skt. *ratha-* "chariot", *su-ratha-* "having a good chariot". For substantival use, see on *uvaspā*, above.

16 E: on both sides of a marble plaque, parts of the first four and of the last four lines; the opening formula shows that very little is to be restored at the left.

- 1 [*ba*]ga | vazar[*ka* / *Auramazdā* / *hya* / *im-*
- 2 *ā*]m | būmim [/ *adā* / *hya* / *avam* / *as-*
- 3 *m*]ānam | ad[*ā* / *hya* / *martiyam* / *a-*
- 4 *dā* /] *hya* [/ . . .

Reverse:

- 1 . . . /] θ[*ātiy* / *Dārayavauš* / *Xš* / *mā-*
- 2 *m* /] *Auramaz*[*dā* / *pātuv* / *hadā* / *viθaiθ-*
- 3 *iš* /] *bagaibi*[*š* / + + + + + / *Aura-*
- 4 *maz*]dā | θuv[*ām* / *dauštā* / *biyā*

"A great god (is) Ahuramazda, who created this earth, who created yonder heaven, who created man, who . . .

" . . . Says Darius the king: May Ahuramazda with the royal gods protect me! . . . , may Ahuramazda be a friend to thee."

Scheil completed the obverse, but not all of the reverse. If his restoration of the last line is right (and it is hard to see what *θa-u-va-* can represent except *θuvām*), then a vocative is needed in the gap left unfilled above, as antecedent to the pronoun of the second person; some word meaning "reader", "friend", "loyal subject", "passer-by", would be appropriate.

Xerx. Sus. 23 Scheil (p. 81, with line drawing), in two lines on the base of a column; trilingual.

- 1 𐎧𐎠𐎵 | Xšayāršā | xšāyaθiya | vašnā | Auramazdāh[ā / ima /]
2 hadiš | Dārayavauš | xšāyaθiya | akunauš | hya | manā [/ pitā]

“Says Xerxes the king: By the grace of Ahuramazda, this palace Darius the king made, who (was) my father.”

Scheil's copy has *a-ku-u-na-u-ša*, presumably by dittography in copying.

This inscription is a duplicate of Xerx. Sus.; see Tolman, *APL* 1.

Xerx. Sus. 25 Scheil (pp. 84-5, with line drawing), two copies of a four-lined inscription on the base of a column; also a Bab. version in two copies, each in 5 lines.

- 1 [adam / Xšayāršā / XŠ / vazarka / XŠ / XŠyānām / XŠ /
DAHy]n²nām XŠ / a²
2 [hyāyā / BUyā / Dārayavahauš / XŠyahyā / puça / Hazāma]-
n²išiya |²
3 [θātiy / Xšayāršā / XŠ / Dārayavauš / XŠ / hadiš / i]ma |
akunauš |²
4 [hya / manā / pitā / vašnā / Auramazdāhā / adam / a]k²unavam²

“I am Xerxes, great king, king of kings, king of countries, king of this earth, son of Darius the king, the Achæmenian. Says Xerxes the king: Darius the king built this palace, who (was) my father; by the grace of Ahuramazda I (also) built it.”

Badly damaged characters: a 1]u-, 4]k-; b 1]n-, 3]a-, 4]u-. In b 3, *a-ku-u-na-ša* is written, with omission of the second *u*. The Bab. version gives part of the name Darius in the third line.

Scheil restores [*hadiš imā*]m in 3, after line 4 of the Bab.: [*ha*]-diš *a-ga-a*, where *hadiš* may be borrowed from the OP; the postposition of the demonstrative is peculiar, but may be due to the influence of the Bab. But he is wrong in restoring a feminine demonstrative, after Art. Sus. c 5, Art. Sus. 28. 3; for in inscriptions of Xerxes the correct neuter form is always used, as in Xerx. Pers. c, d, Sus. 2.

Xerx. Sus. 26 Scheil (p. 86, with line drawing); on a fragment of a marble plaque; unilingual.

- 1 [*adam* / *Xšayāršā* / *xšāyaθiya* / *vazarka* / *xšā*]yaθiya | xšāya-
[*θiyānām* / *xšāya*-
- 2 *θiya* / *dahyūnām* / *Dārayavahauš* / *xšāyaθiya*]hyā | puça |
Ha[*xāmanišiya* /
- 3 *θātiy* / *Xšayāršā* / *xšāyaθiya* / *xšāyaθiyān*]ām | pasā[*va* / *tya*
/ *adam* / *xšāya*-
- 4 *θiya* / *abavam* / *aīta* / *adam* / *yānam* / *jadyāmi*]y | Aura-
[*mazdām* / *mām* /
- 5 *Auramazdā* / *pātuv* / *hadā* / *bagaibiš* / *utamaiy* /] xšaça[m]

“I am Xerxes, great king, king of kings, king of provinces, son of king Darius, the Achæmenian. Says Xerxes, king of kings: After that I became king, I pray this (as) a favor of Ahuramazda, may Ahuramazda with the gods protect me and my kingdom.”

The first characters of lines 1 and 2, and the first and last characters in lines 4 and 5 are badly damaged.

The inscription is assigned by Scheil to Xerxes rather than to Darius because of *xšaçam* in the final prayer, a phrasing found in inscriptions of Xerxes (Pers. a, b, d; restoration merely in Xerx. Van).

For the idiom in 4, cf. Dar. Pers. d 21 and NRa 54. The insertions from *tya* to *yānam* are mine; so also the addition of *hadā bagaibiš* in 5. At the end there may have been *utā tyamaiy kartam*, as in Xerx. Pers. b, d.

Dar. II Sus. 5 A Scheil (p. 31; p. 41, with line drawing).

- 1 [..... / *vašnā* / *AM*]hā | st[*ūnam* / *a*]θagainam | Dāra-
- 2 [*yavauš* / *XŠ* / *akuna*]uš | Dāra[*yavau*]m | AM pātuv

“By the grace of Ahuramazda the stone column Darius the king made; may Ahuramazda protect Darius!”

Much mutilated characters in italics: 1]hā; 2]uš.

Scheil, p. 82, remarks on his No. 24 that the third person verb *akunauš* shows that the king named in the inscription is not the writer of it. But the prayer for protection must refer to a living king and not to his dead father, and this is accordingly an inscription of Darius. As between Darius I and Darius II, I have as-

signed the inscription to the latter because of the similarity in phrasing to Dar. II Sus. 24 and Art. Ham. b.

1 [AM]hā: so for Scheil's]nā; I take the character *na* to be a *ha* lacking the first angle-sign. But unless other lines of text preceded, the space requires the full writing of the name, despite the use of the ideogram in the next line.

2 *st[ūnam a]θagainam*: the space requires *-nam* in the noun as in the adj. Though *stūnā aθagainiya* in Dar. Sus. 1. 45 is fem., there may later have been a doublet form of masc. gender in OP, as in Avestan (*ĀiW* 1067). Unvala's emendation to *stūnām aθagainām* is therefore unnecessary.

Dar. II Sus. 24 Scheil (pp. 82-3, with line drawing), in three lines on the base of a column; a fragmentary Bab. inscription of different content stands on the same column.

1 [*apadānam* / *st*]ūnāya [/ *aθagainam* / *Dāra*]ya-

2 [*vauš* / *XŠ* / *vaza*]rka | akunau[š / *Dā*]raya-

3 [*vaum* / *AM* / *pā*]tuv | hadā | BGibiš

"The stone palace of the columns Darius the great king built; may Ahuramazda with the gods protect Darius!"

Mutilated characters in italics: 1]*ya*-; 2 *-na-u*-,]*ra-ya*-; 3]*tu-u*-*va*. An ideogram for *baga* "god" is here found for the first time; it consists of a horizontal, followed by another horizontal, an angle, and a second angle.

The inscription is here restored after Art. Ham. b (q. v. on *apadānam*); cf. also Dar. Sus. 5 and Dar. II Sus. 5 A. The name of the king does not appear in either the OP or the Bab., but the certain *ya* at the end of line 2 requires either Darius or Xerxes; and this *ya* is preceded by the lower part of a vertical which could belong to the *ra* preceding the *ya* in *Da-a-ra-ya-va-u-ma*, but could not be the *ša* preceding the *ya* in *Xa-ša-ya-a-ra-ša-a-ma*. The spacing also favors the name of Darius.

Scheil assigns this inscription to Xerxes, but I have given it to Darius II for the same reasons as the preceding inscription (Scheil's 5 A).

1 [*st*]ūnāya: a form unexplained from either the fem. stem (Dar. Sus. 1. 45) or the masc. (Dar. II Sus. 5 A, q. v.); we expect *stūnānām* "of the columns" (like Scheil's restoration in Dar. Sus. 5). Possibly it is an abbreviated gen. pl. **stūnāyām*, with

-āyām replacing -ānām by the analogy of -āyā in the gen., loc., abl. sg. of fem. ā stems.

Art. Sus. 28 Scheil (pp. 91-3, with line drawing), on the base of a column; trilingual.

- 1 [a]dam | Artaxšaça | XŠ | vazarka | XŠ XŠyānām | XŠ |
DAHyūnām XŠ | a[hyāyā /
2 BU]yā | Dārayavauš | Xšahyā | puça | Haxāmanišya | ʃātiy |
Arta[xšaça / XŠ /
3 vašn]ā | AMhā | imām | hadiš | tyā | jivadiy | paradayadām |
adam | aku[navam /
4 AM / u]tā | Mītra | mām | pātuv | hacā | vispā | gāstā | uta-
[mai / hadiš]

“I am Artaxerxes, great king, king of kings, king of countries, king of this earth, son of Darius the king, the Achæmenian. Says Artaxerxes the king: By the grace of Ahuramazda this is the palace which I in my lifetime built as a pleasant retreat; may Ahuramazda and Mithra protect me from all harm, and my palace.”

Badly mutilated characters: 2]y-, 4 -ta[.

As in all inscriptions of Artaxerxes II, the writing shows inaccuracy, as appears from the following comments:

1 *Artaxšaça*: the -ta- begins with three parallel horizontals instead of two.

2 *Dārayavauš*: nom. form, for gen.

2 *XŠ-a-ha-ya-a*: for the usual *XŠ-ya-ha-ya-a*.

2 *Haxāmanišya*: written without the *i* after the *ša*.

3 *imām hadiš*: fem. demonstrative modifying neuter noun, as in Art. Sus. c 5.

3 *jivadiy*: written *ji-va-* instead of *ji-i-va-*, and the *ji* character closes with two parallel horizontals instead of three.

4 *Mītra*: without the separate *i* character, as always except in Art. Ham. b.

4 *pātuv*: singular verb with two subjects; or possibly plural, *pā^{nt}uv*.

4 *gāstā*: with long vowel in the first syllable, though in Dar. NRa 57-8 the vowel is short—if the two words be identical.

The meaning of *jivadiy paradayadām* is uncertain, but it is con-

sidered by Scheil to be "without doubt the name of the palace", just as Xerx. Pers. a 12 gives the name *visadahyum* "of all nations" to his *duvarθi*- "colonnade"; he compares the poetic name of Babylon *TIN-TIR(ki)* = *šubat balāṭi* "séjour de vie", and the Avestan *pairidaēza*- "Umwallung, Ummauerung" (*AIW* 865), whence Greek *παράδεισος*, NP *pālēz* "garden". Benveniste, p. 67, rejects this explanation and conjectures that there is here a corruption, since the equivalent of Av. *pairidaēza*- would in the accusative be *pa-ra-i-da-i-da-ma*, and not *pa-ra-da-ya-da-a-ma*; though the second part might be identical with OP *didā*. It is tempting to conjecture that the phrase should be as follows: *ima hadiṣ tya jivadiy parididām adam akunavam* "this (is) the palace which I in my lifetime constructed as an enclosure (= safe and pleasant place)". The accusative phrase, with the wrong gender, is transferred to the nominative; *jivadiy* is for nom. *jīva* with the particle *-diy* = Av. *zī*, Skt. *hi*; cf. *ufrāštā-diy* Bh. 4. 69;¹¹ and *paradayadām* is miswritten. Cf. *par[idištam]* Dar. Sus. 1. 56, with note.

Dar. Ham. b; trilingual, in duplicate on a gold and a silver plate.

Cf. J. M. Unwalla, in *Jame Jamshed*, Sept. 30, 1926 (not accessible to me); E. Herzfeld, *Deut. Lit.-Zeitg.* 47. 2105-8 (1926); Sidney Smith, *JRAS* 1926. 433-6; C. D. Buck, *Lang.* 3. 1-5 (1927); L. H. Gray, *JRAS* 1927. 97-101; J. M. Unwalla, "Two New Historical Documents of the Great Achæmenian King Darius Hystaspes", in *Journal of the Cama Oriental Institute*, No. 10, 1-3 (1927); F. H. Weissbach, *ZfA* 37. 291-4 (1927); E. Schwentner, *ZfA* 6. 171-3 (1928); E. Herzfeld, "A New Inscription of Darius from Hamadan", in *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 34, 7 + iii pp. (1928).

The two tablets (gold, 19 x 19 cm.; silver, 10.5 x 14.5 cm.) were found by a Persian near Hamadan, between old building blocks.

¹¹ I still hold to the interpretation of Bh. 4.69 which I offered in *JAOS* 35. 351-2: *avaiy mā dauštā [biy]ā ufrāštādiy parsā* "these do thou not befriend; verily punish them well (-punished)", in which *ufrāštā* is acc. pl., and *-diy* is the emphatic enclitic. Benveniste's view, *BSLP* 31. 2. 64-5, is that *diy* is a resumptive pronoun; but he would have to assume that *di-i-ya* is written by error for *di-i-ša* = *diš*, which is more difficult than my view.

After he had cut them into several pieces for smelting, a dealer in antiques noticed the inscriptions and bought them, put the pieces together and had photographs made; line drawing of the gold tablet in Smith's article, and reproduction of the photograph of the silver tablet in Unwalla's. The two texts agree absolutely except in the line division; one or more characters at the end of each of the first seven lines of the gold tablet stand at the beginning of the next line of the silver tablet. An occasional character is damaged, and the first character is lost in lines 1-4 (two in line 3) of the silver tablet; but no doubt whatever exists as to any reading. Our text follows the line division of the gold tablet.

- 1 Dārayavauš | XŠ | vazarka | XŠ | XŠyanām | XŠ | dahy-
- 2 uvnām | Vištāspahyā | puça | Haxāmanišiya |
- 3 θātiy | Dārayavauš | XŠ | ima | xšaçam | tyā | ada-
- 4 m | dārayāmiy | hacā | Sakaibiš | tyaiy | pa-
- 5 ra | Sugdam | amata | yātā | ā | Kušā | hacā | Hida-
- 6 uv | amata | yātā | ā | Spardā | tyamaiy | Aurama-
- 7 zdā | frābara | hya | mašišta | bagānām | m-
- 8 ām | Auramazdā | pātuv | utāmai | višam

"Darius the great king, king of kings, king of the countries, son of Hystaspes, the Achæmenian. Says Darius the king: This is the kingdom which I hold, from the Scythians who are beyond Sogdiana, from there to Ethiopia; from India, from there to Sardis—(the kingdom) which to me Ahuramazda gave, the greatest of gods. May Ahuramazda protect me and my royal house."

1 *XŠyanām*: written *-ya-na-a-ma*; the *a* which should follow the *ya* to give the proper length in the correct *-yānām* has been omitted by error.

1-2 *dahyuvnām*: *-ya-u-va-na-*, in imitation of *paruvnām* (Dar. NRa 6, 7; Art. Pers. a 6, 7 in all copies; Art. Pers. b 8-9, 10), which extends the orthography of nominative *paruv* into the paradigm before a consonantal ending; cf. also the compound *paruvzanānām* (Xerx. Pers. b. 15-6, da 11, db 15-6; divided into two words *paruv* / *zanānām* Xerx. Pers. a 8 all copies, ca 7, cb 11-2, Van 12), where the writing of the simplex has entered the compound.

4-6 *hacā* governs the instr. *Sakaibiš* 4, but the loc. *Hidauv* 6. On the syncretism of these cases with the usual abl. after *hacā*, see Buck, *l. c.*, pp. 3-4.

4-5 *para*: cf. *avaparā* Bh. 3. 71, *hyāparam* Bh. 3. 43, 63.¹²

5 *Sugdam*: the writing *sa-u-ga-da-ma* of this passage shows, as has long been suspected, that the writing *sa-u-gu-u-da* = *Suguda* (Bh. 1. 16, Dar. NRa 23; both somewhat mutilated; abl. in Dar. Sus. 1. 38, complete) is an incorrect representation; cf. Av. *suγda-*, Greek *Σογδ-ανή*.

5 *amata*: an ablatival adverb in *-tos*, from the demonstrative stem *ama-*, found (rarely) in Sanskrit; so Buck, pp. 4-5, and Jackson ap. Gray, p. 101. Cf. OP *paruviyata*, Av. *xʷatō*, *aiwītō*, Skt. *ātas*, *ītas*, *tātas*, etc. (Whitney, *Skt. Gram.* § 1098), Greek *ἐρός*, *ἐκτός*, Latin *caelitus*, *funditus*, etc.; *amata* / *yātā* / *ā* "hinc usque ad" (Buck). *Amata* is not to be associated with the dubious reading *āmātā* Bh. 1. 7, a. 11 (Smith), nor taken as a participle to *ā-mad-* (Herzfeld), nor to *ā-man-* (Weissbach), nor to *ā-mā-* (Schwentner), nor as from **ā-sma-tā* with pronominal element **sma* (Gray).

5 *yātā*: already known as a conjunction "while", found in Bh. and in Dar. NRa 51; but here for the first time as part of a prepositional *yātā* / *ā* "unto". *Yātā* alone is a preposition in Dar. Sus. 1.

5 *ā*: previously known in OP as postposition enclitic to the locative, but here for the first time as independent word.

5 *Kušā*, 6 *Spardā*: probably abl. sg. with *ā* to denote the goal, as in Skt.; so Buck and Gray. Another possibility is that they are acc. pl. of the ethnic; cf. *Spardā* "Sardians" in Dar. Sus. 1. 52, for the Avestan has also the acc. with *ā* in this use.

Art. Ham. b; unilingual, in one long line on the base of a column; published by E. Herzfeld, *Altorientalische Studien Bruno Meissner zum 60. Geburtstag 1928 gewidmet* == *Mitteilungen der altorientalischen Gesellschaft*, 4. 85-6.

apadānam | stūnāya | aḍagainam | Artaxšaça | XŠ | vazarka |
a[kuna]uš | hya | Dārayavauš | XŠ | puçā | Haxāmanišiya |
Mit[ra mām / pātuv]

"The stone palace of the columns Artaxerxes the great king built, the son of King Darius, the Achæmenian. May Mithra protect me!"

¹² The finding of the word here shows that Rawlinson, *JRAS* 10. 297 (1846), was right in restoring Dar. NRa 28-9 *Sakā* / *tyai[y / pa]radraya*, where later scholars have read *taradraya*.

Badly mutilated characters in italics: *a*[ku- . . . -*vauš* . . . *pučā* | *Haxāma-* . . . *Mit*[.

The inscription was found at Hamadan by Herzfeld in June, 1926, and (as he remarks) has the usual inaccuracies of the inscriptions of Artaxerxes II: the lack of a demonstrative at the beginning, the strange *stūnay(a)* instead of the genitive plural, the use of the nominative of Darius and of the ideogram for king without inflectional ending instead of the genitive forms, the long final of *pučā*.

apadānam: hitherto found as *apadāna* only, Art. Sus. a 3, Art. Ham. a 5; this form with *-m* suggests that the word is really a neuter *-no-* stem, a commoner formation than the *-nes / nos-* stem assumed for *apadāna*. One writing or the other must be incorrect.

stūnāya: apparently an error for *stūnānām*; but cf. note on Dar. II Sus. 24.

Mit[*ra / mām / pātuv*]: Herzfeld's restoration, which is very probable, in view of the writing *Mⁱtra* in Art. Ham. a 6, instead of *Miθra* as in Art. Pers. a, b, Art. Sus. a.

GRAMMATICAL SUMMARY

These inscriptions add the following to our knowledge of the Old Persian language; the occurrence of the words and forms and the notes upon them in the preceding commentary may be found by using the "Concordance and Glossary":

Phonology: Primitive IE *tn* > Iranian *θn* > OP *šn*: *arašnīš*.
Anaptyxis: incorrect in *Sugudā*; cf. *Sugdam*.

Morphology: nouns, adjectives, pronouns.

ǎ-stem, ndm. in *-ā*: *ubā*.

ī-stem, apm. in *-īš*: *arašnīš*.

ī-stem, adj. npf. in *-iya*: *aθagāiniya*.

Pronominal gsf. formed on stem from gsm.: *haruvahyāyā*.

Similar lsf., but with haplology: *visahyā*.

Pronominal isn.: *tyanā*; abl. sg. n. on inst. stem: *avanā*.

Morphology: verbs:

Pret. ind. act. 3 dual: *ajīvatam*; see under *jīv-*.

Pret. ind. act. 3 pl.: *akunavaša*; see under *kar-*.

Pret. ind. mid. 1 sg.: *amanīyaiy*; see under *man-*.

Pres. subj. mid. 1 sg.: *kunavānaiy*; see under *kar-*.

Pret. ind. pass. 3 sg. or pl.: *frāsah[y]*, *akaniy*, *akariy*, *ajaniy*, *abariy* f[*rābariy*]; see under *asah-*, *kan-*, *kar-*, *jan-*, *bar-*.

Syntax:

apiy, postposition w. acc., 1. 54.

para, preposition w. acc., DHb. 4.

yātā, prep. w. loc., 1. 32, 34; w. adv. (restoration), 1. 23.

yātā ā, prep. phrase w. abl., DHb. 5, 6.

hacā, prep. w. abl. (often); w. inst., DHb. 4 *Sakaibiš*; w. loc., 1. 33 *Bābirauv*, 1. 44 *Hidauv*, DHb. 5 *Hidauv*; w. adv., 1. 47 *avadaša*.

tya, conj. w. ind., introducing object clause of fact, 1, 28, 28, 29; clause of result, 11. 4; indep. jussive, 7. 5 (restoration); *pasā[va tyā]* "after this, that", XS 26. 3.

Vocabulary: the following new words are found:

Nouns: [*au*] *raθaram*, *axšaina*, *a[θagam]*, *arašniš*, *arjana[m]*, *ardatam*, *asada*, *ištiš*, *uraθā*, *katam*, *kapautaka*, *karnuvakā*, *kāsaka*, *θaramiš*, *θikā*, *darana[m]*, *daraniyam*, *aurina*, *niykarā*, *paradayadām*, *piruš*, *barsnā*, *yakā*, *sikaba* + *uda*, *stūnā*. Places: *Abirāduš*, *Ujaiy*, [*Ka*] *rmānā*, *Kušā*, *Čušāyā*, *Labanāna*. Ethnic: *Mādayā*, *Mudrāyā*, *Yaunā*, *Spardā*.

Adjectives: *ucāram*, *ubā*, *dāruva*, *frašam*, *frašta*, *vispā*. Participles: [*unīd*] *ātam*, *par[idištam]*, *katam*, *pištā*.

Verbs: [*a*] *vārasa[m]*, *frāsah[y]*.

Adverbs: [*an*] *iyathā*, *amata*, *-diy*, *dūradaša*, *fravata*.

Prepositions: *apiy* (postposition), *para*, *yātā*, *yātā ā*.

Orthographic Variation or Error:

Failure to write *ī*: *īvadiy* AS 28. 3; *Mitra* AS 28. 4, cf. *Mitra* AHb; *Vīštāspahyā* 8. 9, 9. 2, 11. 2.

Semivowels before consonants: *dahyuvnām* DHb. 1; *niykarā* 1. 49 (divided [*nī*] *y* / *ka[rā]* in 3).

Miscellaneous: *apadānam* AHb; *imām* AS 28. 3; *akunaš* 14. 1, XS 25 b. 3; XŠ gen. AHb; XŠ *ahyā* AS 28. 2; XŠ *yanām* DHb. 1; *gāstā* AS 28. 4; *dacaram* 4. 3; *Dārayavauš* gen. AS 28. 2, AHb; *paradayadām* AS 28. 3; *pučā* AHb; *stūnam* D²S 5A. 1, *stūnāya* D²S 24. 1, AHb; *Haṣāmanišya* 11. 2, AS 28. 2; *haruvahyāya* 8. 8.

CONCORDANCE AND GLOSSARY

All the words in the preceding inscriptions are listed in the Concordance, except those in Fragment ? of No. 1 (see p. 196), those in No. 12, and most of those in 16A and B.

Number alone = Inscription of Darius I at Susa.

XS = Inscription of Xerxes at Susa.

D²S = Inscription of Darius II at Susa.

AS = Inscription of Artaxerxes II at Susa.

DH = Inscription of Darius I at Hamadan.

AH = Inscription of Artaxerxes II at Hamadan.

The line number is omitted if the inscription has but one line.

An overrunning word is listed by the line in which it begins.

r before line numbers means line of the reverse side.

- means that one or more characters of the word are entirely lost.

° means that the word is a restoration merely.

n means that there is a note to this word at this place in the commentary.

The tense of verbs is indicated, if it is not the present; the mood, if not indicative; the voice, if not active; the person and number, if not third singular.

a- neg. prefix, see *axšaina*.

a- "this" *ahyāyā* gsf. 1.7-, 15; 3.2°; 4.2°; 5.1-; 6.1-, 4; 7.1°; 15.10°; 16D.5°; XS 25.1-; AS 28.1-. *ahyāyā* lsf.: 7.2°; 16D.1-.

ā "to", prep. w. abl.: DHb. 5n, 6.

aita "this", asn.: XS 26.4°.

aivam "one", asm.: 1.4-, 5-; 15.6°, 6-.

auradaram "united with Ahura", asm.: 16A.3-n.

Auramazdā "Ahuramazda", nsm.: 1. 1-, 8-, 14-, 15-, 17°, 19°, 21°, 57-; 15. 3°; 6.3°; 15.1°, r1°; 16C.3°; 16D.6-; 16E.1°, r2-, r3-; XS 26.5°; DHb. 6, 8. *Auramazdām*, acc.: 1.18-; 16C.3-; 16D.6-; XS 26.4-. *Auramazdāha*, gen.: 1.12, 21°, 56-; 6.4°; 10. 2. *Auramazdāhā*, gen.: XS 23.1-; XS 25.4°. *AM*, nom.: 7.3°, 3°, 4, 6°; 9.4n, 4, 5; 13.1°, 2; 14.1°; D²S 5A.2; D²S 24.3°; AS 28.4°. *AMm*, acc.: 9.4; 13.2°. *AMha*, gen.: 4.3°; 11.4; 14.3°. *AMhā*: 7.4°, 5; D²S 5A.1-n; AS 28.3.

axšaina "hematite", nsm.: 1.39n.

aḡagam "rock", asm.: 1.24-n.

aḡagainam "of stone", asm.: D²S 5A.1-n; D²S 24.1°; AHb. *aḡagainiya*, npf.: 1.45n.

Aḡuriya "Assyrian", nsm.: 1.32.

adam "I", nom.: 1.5, 18°; 2; 3.1; 4.1°; 5.1; 6.1-; 7.1°, 2°, 5°; 8.1; 9.1, 4; 11.1, 4, 5-; 13.1°; 15.7-; 16C.3; 16D.6°; XS 25.1°, 4°; XS 26.1°, 3°, 4°; AS 28.1-, 3; DHb. 3. *mām*, acc.: 1.9, 10, 14-, 17-, 57; 6.3°; 7.4°, 6°; 15.r1°; 16C.4°; 16D.6; 16E.r1°; XS 26.4°; AS 28.4; DHb. 7; AHb°. *manā*, gen.: 1.12-, 13, 58; 9.4; XS 23.2;

XS 25. 4°. -*mai*y, gen.: 1. 10-, 16°, 18°, 19°, 20°, 57-, 58-; 7. 3°, 3°, 5°, 6°; 9. 5; 10. 4; 13. 1°; 15. r2°, r3°; 16C. 4-; 16D. 5°, 7°; XS 26. 5°; AS 28. 4°; DHb. 6, 8.

aniyā "other, one or other (part of)", nsf.: 1. 25-n, 26-.

aniyathā "otherwise": 7. 3-n.

apadānam "palace", asn.: D²S 24. 1°; AHbn.

apiy "on", postposition w. acc.: 1. 54n; cf. *ḍūraiapiy*.

Abirāduš "Aphrodisias", nom.; 1. 46n.

amata "thence": DHb. 5n, 6.

ar- "go, come"; *ava* + *ar-* "go down", *avārasam* pret. 1 sg.: 1. 24-n.

arašniš "cubit, foot", apm.: 1. 26n, 26.

Ariya "Aryan", nsm.: 15. 13°. *Ariya ciça* "of Aryan lineage", nsm.: 15. 13-.

arjanam "ornamentation", nsn.: 1. 23°n, 41-n.

Artaxšaça "Artaxerxes", nsm.: AS 28. 1n, 2-; AHb.

ardatam "silver", nsn.: 1. 40n.

Aršāma "Arsames", nsm.: 1. 13-n.

ava, verbal prefix, see *ar-*.

ava "that"; *avam* asm. 1. 2°; 15. 2; 16E. 2°. *avām*, asf.: 1. 27. *ava*, nsn.: 1. 20°, 42; 10. 4. *ava*, asn.: 1. 21°; 7. 4°; 11. 4; 13. 1°. *avanā*, abl-inst. sg. n.: 1. 31n. *avaiy*, npm.: 1. 48, 50°, 51, 53, 54°.

avathā "then": 1. 14°n; 18. 4°.

avadā "there": 1. 48.

avadaša "thence": 1. 47n.

āvahanam "village", nsn.: 1. 46-.

asada "copper", nsm.: 1. 40n.

asah-, in *fra* + *asah-* "construct": *frāsay*, pret. pass.: 1. 27-n.

aspam "horse", asm.: 1. 16°n; 16D. 1°.

asmānam "firmament", asm.: 1. 2-; 15. 2-; 16E. 2-.

āha "be", pret.: 18. 4°; 7. 4; 10. 5.

idā "here": 1. 23°, 37-n, 38, 40, 43, 45-.

imam "this", asm.: 4. 3. *imām*, asf.: 1. 1-; 15. 1-; 16E. 1-; AS 28. 3n. *ima*, nsn.: 18. 55°; DHb. 3. *ima*, asn.: 1. 10-, 22-n; 5. 3°; 14. 4°; XS 23. 1°; XS 25. 3-n.

ištiš "brick", ns.: 1. 29n. *ištiyā*, loc.: 1. 53°.

u- "well", in cpds.; see *ucāram*, *ucasma*, *unidātam*, *umartiyam*, *urathā*, *uvaspam*.

ucāram "well done", nsn.: 10. 5n.

ucašma "eye": 16B. 2-.

Ujāiy "Uja, Caria", lsm.: 1. 46n.

utā "and": 1. 13, 16-, 28, 28, 29, 33n, 35, 36, 37, 40, 44, 44, 48, 50, 52, 54°, 55, 57°, 58°; 7. 3°; 15. r2-; 16D. 7°; AS 28. 4-; DHb. 8. *uta-*: 1. 58; 7. 6°; 15. r2°; 16C. 4; XS 26. 5°; AS 28. 4.

unidātam "well laid", asn.: 1. 56-n.

upariy "on", prep. w. acc.: 1. 27-.

upastām "aid", asf.: 1. 18-; 9. 5.

ubā "both", ndm.: 1. 14n.

umartiyam "with good men", asn.: 1. 11-.

uraṭhā "good cars", apm.: 16D. 5n.

Uvārazmiyā "Chorasmia", abl.: 1. 39.

uvaspam "with good horses", asn.: 1. 11-. *uvaspā* "good horses", apm.: 16D. 5°n.

kaufa "mountain", nsm.: 1. 31.

katam "excavation", nsn.: 1. 25n.

kan- "dig"; *akaniy*, pret. pass.: 1. 24n, 25-n, 28, 29.

kapautaka "lapis lazuli", nsm.: 1. 37n.

kāma "wish", nsm.: 1ḏ. 4.

kar "make, do"; *kunautiy*: 16D. 2°, 3-n, 4-, 6°. *akunavam*, pret. 1 sg.: 1. 22°, 56°; 4. 3°; 5. 3°; 6. 4°; 7. 2°, 3, 4, 4°; 11. 4; 13. 2°; 14. 4-; XS 25. 4-; AS 28. 3-. *akunauš*, pret.: 1. 4, 10, 15, 17°, 21°, 30; 1ḏ. 4°; 6. 3°; 15. 5-; XS 23. 2; XS 25. 3; D²S 5A. 2-; D²S 24. 2; AHb-. *akunaš*: 14. 1-; XS 25b. 3n. *akunavaša*, pret. 3 pl.: 1. 50°, 51n, 53-. *akunavatā*, pret. mid. 3 pl.: 1. 48. *akariy*, pret. pass.: 1. 23-, 37n. *kunavānaiy*, subj. mid. 1 sg.: 10. 4n. *cartanaiy*, inf.: 1. 20°. *karta*, pte. pass. nsm.: 1. 38, 40, 43. *kartam*, nsn.: 1. 20°, 58°; 7. 5°; 16D. 7. *kartā*, npf.: 1. 46.

kāra "folk", nsm.: 1. 29, 32.

Karkā "Karkians", npm.: 1. 33n.

karnuvakā "stone-masons", npm.: 1. 47n.

Karmānā "Carmania", abl.: 1. 35-n.

kāsaka "valuable stone", nsm.: 1. 37n, 39. *kāsakaišuv*, lpm.: 1. 51-n.

Kuša "Ethiopia", abl. sg. m.: 1. 43-n; DHb. 5n.

xšačam "kingdom", nsn.: DHb. 3. *xšačam*, asn.: 1. 10-; XS 26. 5-.

xšāyabīya "king", nsm.: 8. 2, 3, 5, 7; 10. 1; XS 23. 1, 2; XS 26. 1°, 1-, 1°, 3°, 3°. *xšāyabīyahyā*, gen.: XS 26. 2-. *xšāyabīyānām*, gpl.: 8. 4; XS 26. 1-, 3-. XŠ: 1. 6, 6, 6, 6, 8, 55; 2 bis; 3. 1°. 1°, 2, 2°; 4. 1°, 1, 1, 1°, 3°; 5. 1°, 1°, 1°, 1°, 3°; 6. 1, 1°, 1°, 1°, 3; 7. 1, 1, 1°, 2°, 5; 9. 1, 1, 2, 4; 11. 1, 1, 2, 3; 13. 1°; 14. 3°; 15. 8°, 8, 9°, 10°; 16C. 1°, 3°; 16E. r1°; XS 25. 1°, 1°, 1°, 1, 3°, 3°; D²S 5A. 2°; D²S 24. 2°; AS 28. 1, 1, 1, 1, 2°; DHb. 1, 1, 1, 3; AHb. *Xšyam*: 1. 4-, 4-, 10, 15°, 17; 6. 3°; 13. 2-; 14. 2°; 16D. 4°. XŠm: 15. 5, 6. *Xšyahyā*: XS 25. 2°. *Xšahyā*: AS 28. 2n. XŠ gen., AHb. *Xšyānām*: 1. 6; 2; 3. 2-; 4. 1; 5. 1°; 6. 1°; 7. 1-; 9. 1; 11. 1; 15. 8-; XS 25. 1°; AS 28. 1. *Xšyanām*: DHb. 1n.

Xšayāršā "Xerxes" nsm.: XS 23. 1; XS 25. 1°, 3°; XS 26. 1°, 3°.

Gadārā "Gandara", abl. sg. m.: 1. 34.

gāstā "harm", abl.: AS 28. 4n.

-cā "and": 16D. 5°, 5.

ciça, see under *Ariya*.

jadiyāmiy "I entreat", 1 sg.: XS 26. 4-.

jan- "strike"; *ajaniy*, pret. pass., "was moulded": 1. 29n.

jiv- "live"; *ajivatam*, pret. 3 du.: 1. 14n.

jiva "living", nsm.: AS 28. 3n.

tuvam "thou"; *θuvām*, acc. sg.: 16E. r4-.

tya "this", dem. asn.: 1. 11, 11; 5. 3°; 6. 4°.

- tya* "which", rel. nsn.: 1. 22°, 36, 57°; 7. 5°; 15. r3°; 16D. 7°. *tya*, asn.: 1. 19°, 58°; 10. 55°; 7. 2°, 3°, 4; 10. 3; 13. 1°; AS 28. 3; DHb. 3, 6. *tyanā*, isn.: 1. 42n. *tyaiy*, npm.: 1. 47-, 49, 51°, 52, 54°; DHb. 4. *tyā*, npf.: 1. 45.
- tya* "that", conj.: 1. 28n, 28, 29 (= *quod* "the fact that"); 7. 5° (= *ut*, jussive); 11. 4 (= *ut*, result); XS 26. 3° (*pasāva tya* = *posteaquam*). *θadayāmai* "seem", 1 sg. mid.: 7. 6-; 11. 5.
- θaramiš* "timber", nsm.: 1. 30n.
- θātiy* "say"; 1. 8, 55-; 4. 2°; 5. 2-; 6. 2-; 7. 2, 4°; 9. 3; 10. 1; 11. 3; 13. 1°; 14. 2°; 16C. 2; 16E. r1-; XS 23. 1; XS 25. 3°; XS 26. 3°; AS 28. 2; DHb. 3. *θāha*, pret.: 1. 20°.
- θikā* "gravel, rubble", nsf.: 1. 25°n, 28. *θikām*, asf.: 1. 27.
- Čūšāyā* "Susa", lsf.: 1. 22°, 34-n; 17. 5-n; 10. 55°; 14. 3-.
- dā-* "create"; *adā*, pret.: 1. 1°, 2, 2-, 3-, 9, 17°; 15. 2°, 3°, 3-, 4; 16E. 2°, 3, 3°.
- dauštā* "friend", nsm.: 7. 4n; 16E. r4°.
- dacaram* "palace", asm.: 4. 3n.
- dar-* "hold"; *dārayāmiy*, 1 sg.: DHb. 4.
- daranam* "structure", asn.: 1. 49-n.
- daraniyam* "gold", nsn.: 1. 35n.
- Dārayavauš* "Darius", nsm.: 1. 5-, 8, 55-; 2; 3. 1°; 4. 1°, 3°; 5. 1, 3-; 6. 1, 3; 7. 1-, 2-, 5-; 8. 1; 9. 1, 3; 10. 1; 11. 1, 3; 13. 1°; 14. 2-; 15. 8-; 16C. 2°; 16E. r1°; XS 23. 2; XS 25. 3°; D°S 5A. 1-; D°S 24. 1-; DHb. 1, 3. *Dārāyavaum*, acc.: 1. 3-; 13. 2; 14. 2°; 15. 5°; 16D. 4°; D°S 5A. 2-; D°S 24. 2-. *Dārayavahauš*, gen.: XS 25. 2°; XS 26. 2°. *Dārayavauš*, gen.: AS 28. 2; AHbn.
- dāruva* "strong, firm", nsm.: 1. 41n.
- dastā* "hand", ism.: 1. 20°.
- dahyūnām* "country", gpf.: 8. 6; XS 26. 2°. *dahyuvnām*: DHb. 1n. *DAHyūnām*: 16C. 1; XS 25. 1-; AS 28. 1. *DAHnām*: 1. 6; 3. 2-; 4. 1-; 5. 1-; 6. 1°; 9. 2; 11. 2; 15. 9°. *DAHum*, acc. sg.: 1. 58-; 7. 6°.
- dīm* "him", asm.: 1. 32.
- did-* "pile up"; *pari-dištam* "enclosed by a wall", ptc. pass. asn.: 1. 56-n.
- didā* "wall", nsf.: 1. 42. *didām*, asf.: 1. 54n.
- diy* "indeed": AS 28. 3n.
- dūraiapiy* "afar": 15. 11°.
- dūradaša* "from afar": 1. 23n.
- naibam* "beautiful", asn.: 6. 4°.
- naiy* "not": 7. 3.
- naurīna* "cedar", nsm.: 1. 30-n.
- nāma* "name" lsn.: 1. 31, 46.
- nī-* prefix: see *unidātam*, *niykarā*, *pis-*, *stā-*.
- niyāka* "grandfather", nsm.: 1. 13-n.
- niykarā* "artisan", npm.: 1. 49n (written *nīly* / *ka[rā]*, 10. 1-).
- pā-* "protect"; *pātuv*, impv.: 1. 57; 7. 6°; 13. 2°; 15. r1-; 16C. 4°; 16D. 7°; 16E. r2°; XS 26. 5°; D°S 5A. 2; D°S 24. 3-; AS 28. 4n; DHb. 8; AHb°.

para "beyond", prep. w. acc.: DHb. 4n.

paradayadām "walled enclosure, pleasant retreat", acc.: AS 28.3n.

pari- prefix, see *di-*, *paradayadām*.

parūnām "many", gpm.: 1.4, 5. *paruvnām*: 15.6-, 7°.

Pārsa "Persian", nsm.: 15.12-. *Pārsahyā*, gsm.: 15.13°.

pasāva "afterward": 1.25; XS 26.3-.

pitā "father", nsm.: 1.12, 58n; XS 23.2°; XS 25.4°.

piruś "ivory", nsm.: 1.43n.

pi- "adorn"; *pištā*, ptc. pass. nsf.: 1.42-n. *ni-pištām* "inscribed", asn.: 15. r3-. [Johnson, IV 35, writes caption *piš*.]

puṣa "son", nsm.: 1.7-; 2; 3.3°; 4.2; 5.2°; 6.2°; 7.2°; 8.10; 9.3; 11.2; 15.12°, 13°; 16C.1°; XS 25.2°; XS 26.2; AS 28.2; DHb. 2. *puṣā*: AHbn.

fra- prefix, see *asah-*, *bar-*, and words here following.

framātāram "lord", asm.: 1.5-; 15.7-.

fravata "forward, downward": 1.28n.

frašam "excellent", asn.: 1.56n.

frašta "exalted", nsm.; 7.6n; 11.5.

Bāxtriya "Bactria", abl. sg. f.: 1.36.

baga "god", nsm.: 1.1°; 14.1°; 15.1°; 16E.1-. *bagānām*, gpm.: 1.9, 19°; DHb. 7. *bagaibiš*, ipm.: 15. r2°; 16E. r3-; XS 26.5°. *BGibiš*: D^sS 24.3n.

Bābirauw "Babylon", lsm.: 1.33-n, 33-n.

Bābiruviya "Babylonian", nsm.: 1.29-n. *Bābiruviyā*, npm.: 1.53-.

bar- "bear, carry"; *abara*, pret.: 1.32. *abara*, pret. 3 pl.: 1.34°. *abariy*, pret. pass.: 1.31-n, 35-, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43-, 45, 47. *baratuv*, impv.: 9.5. *fra + bar-* "bring, grant"; *frābara*, pret.: 1.11-, 18°; DHb. 7. *frābariy*, pret. pass.: 1.23-n.

barānā "height, depth", ism.: 1.26n, 26-.

bū- "be"; *abavam*, pret. 1 sg.: XS 26.4°. *abava*, pret.: 1.25. *biyā*, opt.: 16E. r4°.

būmim "earth", asf.: 1.1-n; 15.2°; 16E.2. *būmiyā*, gsf.: 8.9; 16D.5°. *būmiyā*, lsf.: 16D.2°, 3°. *BU*, nsf.: 1.24, 28. *BUyā*, gsf.: 1.7, 15, 24°; 3.2°; 4.2°; 5.2; 6.2-, 4; 7.1°; 15.10-; XS 25.2°; AS 28.2-. *BUyā*, lsf.: 1.16°; 7.2°, 6°n; 11.5°n.

mā "not": 16B.4, 4.

mabīšta "greatest", nsm.: 1.9, 19°; DHb. 7.

Mādayā "Median", npm.: 1.50-, 54-.

man- "think"; *amanīyāiy*, pret. mid. 1 sg.: 10.3n.

martiyam "man", asm.: 1.2, 16-; 15.3-; 16D.2-; 16E.3°. *martiyahyā*, gsm.: 1.3; 15.4-. *martiyā*, npm.: 1.47, 49°, 52-.

Mitra "Mithra", nsm.: AHb-n. *Mitra*: AS 28.4n.

Mudrāyā "Egypt", abl. sg. m.: 1.41.

Mudrāyā "Egyptian", npm.: 1.50-, 52-, 55-.

Yaunā "Ionia", abl. sg. m.: 1.42.

Yaunā "Ionian", nmp.: 1.33-n, 48, 54°.

yakā "oak", nsf.: 1.34n.

- yātā* "to", prep. w. loc. or adv.: 1.23°, 32n, 34°; with *ā* and abl.: DHb. 5n, 6; "until", conj.: 1.24.
- yabā* "as, when", conj.: 1.25-n; 18.3-; 6.3-; 7.3.
- yad-* "reverence"; *ayadaiy*, pret. mid. 1 sg.: 1.18°; 9.5; 13.2°; 16C.3°; 16D.6°.
- yadiy* "when": 1.14n.
- yūnam* "favor", asn.: XS 26.4°.
- Labanāna* "Lebanon", nsm.: 1.31n.
- vainātiy* "see", subj.: 7.5°.
- vasiy* "much": 6.4°.
- vašnā* "will, grace", ism.: 1.12, 21°, 55-; 4.3-; 6.4; 7.4°, 5; 10.2; 11.4; 14.3°; XS 23.1; XS 25.4°; D²S 5A.1°; AS 28.3-.
- vazarka* "great", nsm.: 1.1°, 6; 2; 3.1°; 4.1-; 5.1°; 6.1°; 7.1; 8.3; 9.1; 11.1; 14.1°; 15.1°, 8°; 16E.1-; XS 25.1°; XS 26.1°; D²S 24.2-; AS 28.1; DHb.1; AHb. *vazarkāyā*, gsf.: 7.1°n; 15.10-.
- vazarkam*, asn.: 1.11.
- viṣam* "royal house", asf.: 15.r2; 16C.4°; DHb.8.
- viṣaiḃiš* "royal", ipm.: 15.r1°; 16E.r2°.
- viṣahyā* "all", lsf.: 7.6n; 11.5-. *viṣam*, nsn.: 1.20°; 10.5n. *viṣam*, asn.: 1.21°; 7.4°.
- viṣpā* "all", abl. sg. n.: AS 28.4.
- viṣpazunānām* "of all men", gpf.: 15.9-.
- Vištāspa* "Hystaspes", nsm.: 1.13-n. *Vištāspahyā*, gsm.: 1.7; 2; 3.2-; 4.2-; 5.2-; 6.2-; 7.1°; 15.11-; 16C.1°; DHb.2. *Vištāspahyā*: 8.9n; 9.2n; 11.2n.
- Sakaḃiš* "Scythians", ipm.: DHb.4n.
- sikaba + uda* "serpentine", nsm.: 1.37n.
- Sugdam* "Sogdiana", asm.: DHb.5n. *Sugudā*, abl.: 1.38n.
- stā* "set"; *niy-aštāya*, pret. "commanded": 7.3°, 3°; 13.1-.
- stūnā* "column", npf.: 1.45n. *stūnānām*, gpf.: 5.3°n. *stūnam*, asm.: D²S 5A.1-n. *stūnāya*, case uncertain: D²S 24.1-n; AHbn.
- Spardā* "Sardis", abl. sg. m.: 1.36-; DHb.6n.
- Spardā* "Sardian", npm.: 1.49°, 52-.
- ša, see *avadaša*.
- šim "him", acc. pron.: 18.4°. -šaiy, gen.: 7.5°.
- šiyātim* "welfare", asf.: 1.3-; 15.4°.
- hauv* "he", nsm.: 1.9, 9-, 30, 31, 38, 39. *hau-*: 1.10, 32.
- Haṣāmanišiya* "Achæmenian", nsm.: 1.7-; 3.3°; 4.2-; 5.2°; 6.2°; 7.2; 8.11; 9.3; 15.12°; 16C.2-; XS 25.2-; XS 26.2-; DHb.2; AHb.
- Haṣāmanišya*: 11.2n; AS 28.2n.
- hacā* "from", prep. w. abl., inst., loc., adv.: 1.31, 33, 34, 35°, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42, 43, 44, 44, 47-; AS 28.4; DHb.4n, 5.
- hadā* "with", prep. w. inst.: 15.r1; 16E.r2°; XS 26.5°; D²S 24.3.
- hadīš* "palace", nsn.: 1.27; 10.55°n; AS 28.3. *hadīš*, asn.: 1.22-n; 5.3°; XS 23.2; XS 25.3°; AS 28.4°.
- Harauvatiyā* "Arachosia", abl. sg. f.: 1.44-.
- haruvahyāyā* "all, the whole", lsf.: 1.16-n; 16D.3°. *haruvahyāya*, gsf.: 8.8n.

Hidauv "India", lsm.: 1. 44n; DHb. 5n.

hya "he, this", nsm.: 1. 9°, 12, 13, 19°, 29, 30, 32, 37, 39; DHb. 7; AHb.

hya "who, which", rel. nsm.: 1. 1, 2°, 2, 3°, 3, 38, 40, 43-; 7. 5; 14. 1°;
15. 1, 2°, 3°, 4°, 5°; 16D. 1°, 2-, 4°, 5°; 16E. 1°, 2°, 3°, 4; XS 23. 2;
XS 25. 4°.

SURVIVING TURKISH ELEMENTS IN SERBO-CROATIAN

JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE
UNITED STATES MINISTER TO JUGOSLAVIA
BELGRADE

THE DEBT of the Serbo-Croatian language to Turkish is a great one; nor is this fact to be wondered at, if it be remembered that from 1459 to 1804, the year of the revolution of Karageorge, Serbia proper was a mere Turkish pashalik, where every attempt at reasserting Slavic nationality was sternly repressed, and furthermore, that the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina was under Turkish rule from 1463 (Herzegovina, 1483) to 1878, when the provinces came under the Austro-Hungarian crown, and subsequently, of course, passed to the present Slavic Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Naturally, therefore, the vocabulary left by Turkish in Bosnian-Croatian is even richer than that which has survived in the purely Serbian idiom.

The object of the following treatise is to set forth as concisely as possible the nature of the still extensive Turkish vocabulary current in Serbo-Croatian, and especially to illustrate the phonetic changes which have taken place in the Turkish material and the manner in which this material is still used.

It will be observed that there are two distinct divisions of Serbo-Croatian which have fallen under this Oriental influence; viz., the purely Serbian idiom, which has retained in the speech of daily life a large number of Turkish substantives, most of which are still known to the vast majority of grown persons in Serbia proper; and, secondly, the language used by the Moslem Slav population of Bosnia-Herzegovina, which is much more Turkified than the Serb proper and, in fact, may be spoken in such a way as to be quite unintelligible in Belgrade. The pure Croatian of Zagreb (Agram) has largely thrown aside these alien elements and substituted many words of genuine Slavic composition and origin, chiefly for concrete objects, which are still expressed by the corresponding Turkish phrases in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In this article I give, first, a specimen of the most extreme dialect, which would be unintelligible to the average Serb; secondly, a list of the most striking phonetic changes which now largely disguise some of the Turkish elements in this hybrid Slav idiom, followed

by a brief commentary; and thirdly, a list of the most commonly used words which are intelligible to every Serb or Bosno-Herzegovinan at the present day. In this vocabulary, words marked with a preceding asterisk (*) are beginning to lose currency, although even these are understood by almost all Serbian speakers.

It should be stated that the material herein was collected, most of it orally, by myself with the assistance of Serbian and Bosnian friends, and I can, therefore, make no claim that this exposition is exhaustive, giving the last word on this interesting subject. As a matter of fact, it is well known that a treasure of oral "literature" in the form of tales and songs awaits future investigators of this somewhat obscure field.

Finally in this connection, it may be added that Russian, as well as Serbo-Croatian, still retains many so-called Tatar (Turkic) words dating from the Tatar occupation of what is now Slavic Russia; cf., for example, *aršin* "ell"; *karmán* "pocket"; *lóšad* "horse", etc.¹ It is not surprising, therefore, that Serbo-Croatian, which suffered a much closer Turkish domination, should have retained an even greater number of these words than Russian. Indeed, the fact that Serbo-Croatian in Serbia and Bosnia was allowed to continue its existence at all often raises the doubt as to whether the mediaeval Turkish rule was really so oppressive as it is the present fashion to record, because it would have been a matter of comparatively little difficulty for the sultans' governments, had they so desired, to have eliminated completely the Slavic dialects (as well as the Christian religion), which, however, were permitted to live a more or less natural life, which has now blossomed forth into a period of development that must certainly end in the eradication of nearly all Oriental elements from the Slavonic languages of Jugoslavia. It seems therefore to be a matter of interest at least to make a start at collecting these Turkish *dissecta membra*, which still give the eastern and southern Serbo-Croatian idioms so picturesque a character.

I have found it impossible to use the accepted official Latin alphabet as prescribed by the Ghazi's Government, because this system is highly inadequate for the purpose of scientific presenta-

¹ Cf. J. D. Prince, "Tatar Material in Old Russian", *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, LVIII, pp. 74-88.

tion, however excellent it may be to teach a hitherto largely illiterate population to pronounce Turkish according to a stereotyped norm. The following illustrations will suffice to show the imperfections of this method of writing Turkish. The vowel *a* is used both for *alif* and *'ayn*, which latter consonant is still plainly pronounced in eastern Turkish; *d* represents د and ض, which are still distinguishable outside the purely Osmanli sphere; the method of indicating palatalized *g* by *ġ* is not in accordance with accepted scientific use, as *ġ* usually indicates *ghayn*; *h* = خ, ح, and ه; the indication of the obscure vowel *ĩ* (= prolonged *u* in *fur*) by the undotted *i* does not catch the eye; *k* is used for ك and ق; *t* = ت, د, and ط; and *z* = ز, ذ, ض, and ظ. Besides these patent imperfections which prevent a student from knowing the historical pronunciation of so many vocables, it is a pity that the new script has adopted the Rumanian *ç* and *ș* (with cedilla), instead of the much more striking *č* and *š*.

In this paper, therefore, I have recorded most of the Turkish words in Latin characters, followed by the original Arabo-Turkish written form. When this is not done, the gutturals ه, ح, and خ are respectively shown by *h*, *h* and *kh*; *g* = palatalized hard *g*; *ġ* = *ġ*; *k* is the palatalized *kāf*; *ĩ* = the indeterminate vowel like *u* in *fur*, while the rest of the notation corresponds to the Latin system used in Serbo-Croatian.

I.

The following conversation in the Bosnian-Croatian between two Moslems was written for me by Mr. Muhammad Begović of Sarajevo, who is thoroughly familiar with his own dialect.

"*Selāmun aléjkum, Rašid Āga.*" "*Aléjkumu selām, Selīm Beg te merhāba.*" "Peace with you, Rašid Āga." "With you peace, Selim Bey, and welcome." This is the common Moslem greeting everywhere.

"*Šta ima novo?*" "*Ima ništa hajirli, ako Bog dā — amīn.*" "What is there new?" "There is nothing good, if God gives it—amen (= unless God gives it)." *hajirli* = خيرلى. Note *ima ništa* would be *nema ništa* with double negative, not observed in this idiom.

"*Ja komšijo kako su tvoji aħbābi i tvoja akrēba?*" "O neigh-

bour, how are thy friends and thy female relative?" *komšíjo*; S² voc. of *komšija* = *komšu* (قومشئى); *ahbábi*, broken pl. *ahbáb* (احباب) of A *habíb* (حبيب) "friend"; *akréba* = (اقربا) A pl. of *karíbe* (قريبه) "female relation"; the -a here is construed as fem. in S.

"*Kupio sam mal i dao kapáru.*" "*Hajirli olsun—dā Alláh baht ti u njoj, Selím—amín.*" "I have bought a property and given a deposit." "May it be well—God give to thee and it good fortune—amen." *mal* "property" (مال); *kapára* "deposit", in T *kapáro*, cf. Ital. *caparra*; *olsun* T optative "may it be"; *baht* "luck"—*bakht* (بخش). Note that the S dat. *ti* "to thee" here should be *tébi*, used in all emphatic sentences. Note the TA *u* for "and", instead of S *i*.

"*Kóliko ima ódaja?*" "*Čétiri ódaja i mútvak čárdāk te divhana i hámam. Doli ima hálvet i magáza.*" "How many rooms are there?" "Four rooms and kitchen, summer house and entrance hall—also a bath. Below are a small room and store-room." *ódaja* "room"—*oda* (اوده); *mútvak* "kitchen"—*mútbakh* (مطبخ); *čardak* "summer-house"—*čardak* (چارداق). Note *doli* "below" is for standard *dolje* "below." *Divhana* "entrance hall"—*divánkhane* (ديوانخانه); *magaza* "store-room"—*mağaza* (مغازه).

"*Osím toga ima bášta za bóstanlúk te áhar za hájvan te lijépa ávlíja sa šádrvánom; sve je uzdurísano merakli.*" "Besides this, there are a garden for vegetables and a stable for animals and a beautiful inner court with a fountain; everything is tastefully arranged." *bášta* "garden"—*bağçe* (باغچه); *áhar* "stable"—*akhýr* (اخور); *hájvan* "animal" (حيوان); *ávlíja* "court"—*avlj* (حولى); *šádrván* "fountain"—(شاهدروان) *uzdurísano*, ptc. S *uz-* and T *dur*, here = "arrange"; *merakli* "tastefully"—*meraklj* (مراقلى).

"*Ima i avdeshána u jednoj ódaji te dúšekluk te dva doláfa i neke rafe te mínder.*" "There is also a lavatory in one room and a folding bed and two cupboards and a sofa." *avdeshána* "ablution chamber"—*ábdestkhane* (ابدستخانه); *dúšekluk*, lit. "a pillow

² The following abbreviations have been used: A = Arabic; P = Persian; S = Serbo-Croatian; T = Turkish; TA = Turco-Arabic.

affair," used here for "a folding bed," which is a sofa by day; *rafa* "shelf"—*raf* (راف); *minder* "sofa"—(مندر).

"*Péndjere imaju, démire i svúkuđ mušėbak, ali još mi je lázum neke stvari; kazán, tékne te (h)ámbar, sáhan, čínija i još hámam i nékoliko maštráfa i lédžen, ibrik i još ánkadar stvari.*" "The windows have iron bars and everywhere shutters (wooden), but I still need some things, a kettle, a trough and a storeroom for grain, china, and yet a (another) bath, and some drinking vessels and a washhandstand, a pail, and many things. *péndjera* "window"—*penjer* (پنجره; from Lat. *fenestra*); *démir* "iron," here = "iron bar"—*demir*, *timur* (تیمور); *mušėbak* "shutter"—(مشباك = "wooden grating"); *lázum* "necessary"—*lazým* (لازم); *kazán* "kettle"—*kazan*, *kazgán* (قزغان); *tekne* "trough"—(تكنه); *hambar* (*h* factitious) "granary"—*anbar* (انبار); *sáhan* "dish"—*sahn* (صحن); *čínija* "china"—*čini* "earthenware" (چینی); *maštráfa* "drinking vessel"—*mašraba* (مشربه); *ibrik* "pail"—(إبريق); *ánkadar* "many"—*ánkadar* "so many" (انقدر).

"*Ali sábur i poláko. Ajluk mi je mali, ali kanátim za hánumom da bi evladi što imadu iza nas.*" "But patience and slowly. My monthly wage is small, but I am saving for my wife, that my children may have something after us." *sabur* "patience"—*sabr* (صبر); *ajluk* "monthly wage"—(إبلىق); *kanátim* verb, "I shall save"—*kanat* "interest" (قناعت); *hánumom* "my wife" = *hanum* with *-ým* (*om*) = "my"—*háným* "lady, wife" (جانم); *evládi* "my children", or pl. "children" with S pl. *-i*—*evlád* (اولاد).

"*Da dā Bog hajirli!*" "*Inša Alláh, Selím Aga.*" "*Alláh emánet Rašíd Aga.*" "*Alláh emánet Selím Beg!*" "*May God give good!*" "*With God's Will, Selim Aga.*" *Allah emanět*, usually followed by *ola*, imper. "may it be"; lit. "may God be a thing of confidence to you" = "thank you"—(الله امانت اولا).

II.

The highly palatalizing character of the Slav Turkish will be especially observed under the combination T *kʷ* = *ć* (= the soft *ch*, something like Eng. *ch* in "cheat").

It should be noticed that real Turks rarely understand many of the Slavified variants of their own words until they have had intercourse with the Serbs and Bosnians who use them.

Phonetic Variations.

T ²	S	S	T
a	aj	<i>majden</i> metal	<i>ma'den</i> (معدن).
a	u	<i>dava</i> lawsuit	<i>da'va</i> (دعوى); hence
		<i>davudjija</i> plaintiff, for	<i>davadji(ja)</i>
		<i>kula</i> castle	<i>ka'la</i> (قلعه) also=T <i>kula</i>
b	f	<i>doláf</i> cupboard	<i>dolab</i> (طوالب)
		<i>maštrāfa</i> drinking vessel	<i>mašrabe</i>
b	m	<i>kamza</i> hilt	<i>ka'bza</i> (قبضة) also =
			<i>kamza</i> in T
b	p	<i>djerdap</i> whirlpool	<i>girdab</i> (گرداب)
		<i>djēp</i> pocket	<i>jēb</i> (جيب)
b	v	<i>ávdes</i> adblution	<i>abđést</i>
		<i>čéváp</i>	<i>k'ebáb</i> chop
		<i>djevap</i> answer	<i>jeváb</i>
d	t	<i>bent</i> volume	<i>bend</i>
		<i>dert</i> illness	<i>derd</i>
		<i>tefter</i> blankbook	<i>defter</i>
		<i>tizluk</i> gaiters	<i>dizlik</i> , from T <i>دز</i> =
			knee
d	z	<i>burázer</i> pal, companion	<i>bíradér</i> brother (TP)
		(common slang) ³	
e	a	<i>béhar</i> spring	<i>bahár</i>

³ There is a well-defined slang in Serbo-Croatian known as *šátrovački* "vagabond language," which is very generally used in southern Serbia. This idiom has comparatively few Turkish words, although *burázer* happens to be one of them. Other very common expressions of this speech are, for example, *mánuk* landlord, master (boss); *mánuka* mistress; *pájkon* policeman, a word which ranks socially about with London *slop* (inversion for *police*). An extremely usual word is also *bajbok* prison, clearly for German *Beiwache* bivouac. The words *mánuk-mánuka* possibly owe their origin to Gypsy *manuš-manuš* man (and) woman, no doubt influenced also by Germ. *Mensch*. The expression *mánuk skíva* (the boss is looking) is as common as "cheese it" in Anglo-American slang. *Skívati* (look) is probably a variant of S *skílití* look cross-eyed, itself from Germ. *schielen*.

T	S	S	T
		<i>halva</i> sweets	<i>helve</i>
		<i>parče</i> piece	<i>parča</i>
		<i>samar</i> saddle	<i>semer</i>
		<i>terterivan</i>	<i>tahtiraván</i> litter between two mules
		<i>jenjičar</i> janissary	<i>jeničeri</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>zeher</i> poison	<i>zehir</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>ije</i>	<i>divánija</i> madman	<i>divané</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>je</i>	<i>jege</i> file	<i>eke</i> (اكه); an unusual mutation, as T initial <i>e-</i> is ordinarily con- stant.
<i>g^v</i>	<i>dj</i>	<i>djérček</i> , true	<i>g^verčék</i>
		<i>sundjer</i> sponge	<i>sung^ver</i> (سونگر)
		<i>zendžil</i> rich	<i>zengin</i>
<i>g^v</i>	<i>dž</i>	<i>ledžen</i> basin	<i>leg^ven</i> (also pr, <i>leyen</i> in T)
<i>ġ</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>agaluk</i> property of an <i>Ága</i>	<i>aġaluk</i>
		<i>bag</i> garden	<i>baġ</i> (P باغ)
		<i>baglama</i> connection	<i>baġlama</i>
		<i>gani</i> rich	<i>ġani</i> (A ذغني; TA)
		<i>galebe</i> crowd	<i>ġaleba</i> many
<i>ġ</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>búzdovān</i> mace	<i>bozdaġān</i> (بوزطغان)
<i>ġč</i>	<i>šč</i>	<i>bašča</i> garden	<i>baġče</i> (باغچه)
		<i>baščovan</i> gardener	<i>baščovān</i>
<i>ġč</i>	<i>št</i>	<i>bašta</i> garden (Belgrade)	<i>baġče</i>
		<i>baštovan</i> gardener	<i>baščovan</i>
<i>i</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>djerdab</i> whirlpool	<i>girdab</i> (گرداب)
<i>i</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>amidja</i> uncle	<i>'amuĵa</i>
		<i>burázer</i> pal; companion	<i>bíradér</i> brother
Intercalated			
<i>'Ayn</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>dova</i> prayer (Moslem)	<i>dū'a</i> (دعا)
<i>ĵ</i>	<i>č, ć</i>	<i>ašćija</i> cook	<i>ašĵi</i>
		<i>ćeiz</i> dowry, trousseau	<i>ĵihaz</i> (also pr. <i>ĵehiz</i>)
		<i>čekić</i> hammer	<i>čekiĵ</i>
<i>k^v</i>	<i>ć</i>	<i>belći</i> on the contrary	<i>belk^vi</i> perhaps

T	S	S	T
		Ćaba = the Kaaba at Mecca	
		ćage	k ^v ajid
		ćemer girdle	k ^v emer
		ćevāp chop	k ^v ebāb
		ćiler cellar	Germ. Keller (!) ⁴
		ćilit lock	k ^v lid lock
		ćispet costume	kisvet
		ćumur coal	k ^v úmur
		ćúprija small bridge	k ^v öprü
		erček male	erk ^v ek
		hećim doctor	hak ^v im
		inćar denial	ink ^v ar
		jelćen sail	jelk ^v en
		meleć angel	melek ^v
		mémlećet country; dis-	memlek ^v ét kingdom;
		trict	state
		šéćer sugar	šek ^v er; etc., passim
k ^v	č	čorav	k ^v ör blind
		čor-sokak	k ^v ör-sokak blind alley
			(کور صفاق)
k (qaf)	k	karaūla	karağol sentry (قره غول)
kh (خ)	k	káduna	khatun woman
		mutvak	mutbakh kitchen
l	lj	zembilj	zembil hamper; basket
n	l	zendjil	zengin rich
n	m	mem	nem wet; a clear mis-
			interpretation of the
			nasal
n(ng)	nj	denjiz	den(ng)iz sea
		jenji	jeni new
		jenjičar	jeničeri janissary
n(voc.)	ü(y)n	izun	iz(i)n permission
o	a	čarapa	čorāb stocking
		karaūla	karağol sentry

⁴ There are many German words, particularly in Serb proper; some of them quite undisguised, used by mechanics who are unwilling to learn the artificial Slavic words for tools, etc., which erudite lexicographers, mostly Croatian, are trying to introduce.

T	S	S	T
		<i>dolāf</i>	<i>dulāb</i> (also <i>dolab</i>) cup-board
ö	o	<i>čorav</i>	<i>k'ör</i> blind
		<i>čor-sokak</i>	<i>k'ör-sokak</i> blind alley
ö	u	<i>urnek</i>	<i>örnek</i> sample (S. <i>prim-jérak</i>)
r	l	<i>čehlubar</i> (<i>čelibar</i>)	<i>kahrubar</i> (pr. <i>kehlibar</i>) amber
r(voc.)	ũ(ỹ)r	<i>sabur</i>	<i>sabr</i> patience (صبر)
t	d	<i>dembel</i>	<i>tembel</i> lazy
u	o	<i>dolāf</i>	<i>dulāb</i> cupboard (also <i>dolab</i>)
		<i>tarpoš</i>	<i>tarbüş</i> fez
u	ũ(u)	<i>bulbul</i>	<i>bülbül</i> nightingale
		<i>muhur</i>	<i>mühür</i> (<i>muhr</i>) seal (S. <i>pečat</i>)
ũ(ỹ)r	r(voc.)	see r(voc.)	ũ(ỹ)r
v	p	<i>espap</i>	<i>esvāb</i> clothes
		<i>čispet</i>	<i>kisvet</i> costume
ỹ	i	<i>ašik</i>	<i>ašyk</i> love (عشيق)
		<i>asli</i>	<i>asly</i> real, genuine
		<i>kazuk</i>	<i>kazyk</i> stake (قازق)
ỹ	l(voc.)	<i>ilum</i>	<i>ilm</i> knowledge (علم)
ỹ	r(voc.)	<i>sabur</i>	<i>sabr</i> patience (صبر)
ỹ	u	<i>hadum</i>	<i>khadẏm</i> servant
		<i>jardum</i>	<i>jadẏm</i> aid
		<i>lazum</i>	<i>ladẏm</i> necessary

An examination of the preceding table of phonetic changes will show the following most important characteristics of the dialect:

Contraction: S *istah* — T *ištiha* desire; appetite; S *djida* — T *jeride* javelin; S *vaz* — T *va'z* preacher (واعظ).

Double letters omitted, a peculiarity of the Yugoslav idioms: S *Alah* — TA *Allah* God.

Insertions; Vocalic: S *pirinač* — T *pirinĵ* rice; Consonants: S *maštrafa* — T *mašraba* drinking vessel (from A شرب).

Metathesis: S *nalet* — T *la'net* curse; S *lepaza* — T *jelpaze* fan;

S *rufet* — T *hurfet* trade; profession (S *rufet* seems to show partial association with German *Beruf*).

Prefixes of Slavonic origin with Turkish verb: *na-súliti* pacify, from TA *sulh* peace. The usual S word is *pomíríti* not, be it observed, with *na-*; *u-tamámiti* complete; finish, from T *tamam* (تمام), for S *usavršiti*.

Omissions, consonantal: S *karaúla* — T *karajol* sentry; S *kazan* — T *kazjan* kettle; vocalic: S *jedžek* — T *jeježek* food.

The following additional omissions are also of interest:

-d (final)	S	<i>éage</i>	T	<i>kʷaghid</i> paper
-f-	S	<i>čitluk</i>	T	<i>čiftlik</i> farm
h-	S	<i>apsána</i>	T	<i>habs-khane</i> prison. The dropping of <i>h</i> is a common phenomenon in Southern Slavonic
j-	S	<i>engeča</i>	T	<i>jengeč</i> crab
je- (syllabic)	S	<i>jedžek</i>	T	<i>jeježek</i> food
-t (final)	S	<i>avdes</i>	T	<i>abdest</i> ritual washing
	S	<i>šerbe</i>	T	<i>šerbet</i> sherbet; drink

So far as strictly grammatical peculiarities are concerned, it should be noted that most Turkish nouns ending in *-a*, *-e*, *-i(ü)*, *-y* take the S feminine *-a* and are declined accordingly. In the following list, however, the words S *kutija* box for T *kutu* (قوتي) and S *džigerica* liver, for T *jiger* are exceptions to the principle indicated above.

Note: S *bimbaša* — T *bimbaši* major (head of a thousand = *bin*). The form *bimbaša* is clearly a confusion with *p(b)aša*; S *bojadžija* painter — T *bojaži* bootblack; S *čuprija* small bridge — T *kʷöprü* (any) bridge; S *džigerica* — T *jiger* liver; S *ekmekdjija* baker — T *ekmekži*. The termination S *-djija* (T *-ži*) is very commonly used in Yugoslavia to denote the agent as *baħšišdjija* a corruptionist (one who receives *bakhšiš*); S *hádžija* pilgrim, either Christian or Moslem — T *hajži*; *jáćija* Moslem prayer before sleep from T *jatsy* from *jat-(mak)* lie down; S *jápija* building material — T *japyž*; S *jáziya* writing — T *jazý*; S *kírija* rent—the only word for this idea in S — T *kira* (كرا); S *kútija* box —

T *kutu* (كوتى ; see above); S *ódaja* room — T *oda* (اوده); S *reza* hinge — T *reze* (رِز). There is no Serbo-Croatian word for “hinge” other than this and *šarka* of uncertain but probably Magyar origin, used in Belgrade. The usual Magyar word for “hinge” is *sark* (pr. *šark*) which is said not to be a Ugric stem(?).

The only adjectival form used with T stems which I can note is -*av*, unquestionably Slavonic; cf. *čorav* blind, from T *kʷör* blind.

There are many verbs with T roots and S endings, preference being given to the exotic -*isati*, a variant of -*irati*, from Germ. -*ieren*, common in loanwords in German, such as *fixieren*. Note the following brief list:

bastisati print — T *bas(mak)* with factitious -*t*; *bitísati* be ended — T *bit(mek)*; *biturísati* finish (va.) — T *bit(mek)* — causative *bitir(mek)*; *bozdísati* spoil (va.) — T *boz(mak)*, with factitious -*d*, the same as -*t* in *bastísati*, but changed to -*d* by assimilation to preceding *z*; *hesábíti* reckon — T *hisáb etmek*; *ışleísati* work — T *ışle(mek)*; *kabarísati* be haughty — T *kibár olmak*; *kabúlití* receive (S *primiti*) — T *kabúl etmek*; *karišterísati* mix — T *karyşdıřr(mak)*; the noun *karişik* an adj. in T, is used in S for “confusion”; *kurtarísati* save — T *kurtar(mak)*; *nasúlití* pacify — from TA *sulh* peace, etc.

Vowel harmony, so characteristic of standard T, is usually ignored in the Turco-Slavonic loanwords: *čitluk* — T *čiftlik* farm; *biturísati* complete — T *bitir(mek)*, where one would expect **bitirísati*, etc.

III.

VOCABULARY OF MOST COMMONLY USED TURKISH WORDS.

A

áferim bravo; well done — *aferin(m)* (افرين).

Aga agricultural title; rank under *Beg* — *ága* (اغا).

**ahar* stable — *akhıřr* (اخور).

Aláh God — *Allah* (الله).

áma but — *amma* (اما).

ámbar grain store-house — *anbar* (انبار).

* Words marked with a preceding asterisk are beginning to lose currency, although understood by almost all Serbian speakers; words with a following asterisk are theoretical forms.

apsána prison — *habskhane* (حبسخانه).

Arnaut Albanian — *Arnaud* (ارناود).

**ásli* real — *asly* (اصلی).

**ášik* lover — *ašyk* (عاشق).

ášcija cook — *asji* (اشچی).

ávdes Moslem ritual washing — *abdest* (ابدست).

**ávdeskháne* lavatory; water closet — *abdest-kháne* (ابدست خانه).

ávlija court-yard — *havly* (حوی).

B

badáva free, gratis — *badi-hewa* (also *badáva*; بادهوا).

badem almond — *badem* (بادم).

**bádjanak* wife's sister's husband — *baĵanák* (باجناق).

badlidjan egg-plant — *pátliĵán* (پاتلجان).

**baht* good luck — *bakht* (بخت).

bájrak flag — *bajrák* (بیراق); see *barjak*.

Bájram Moslem fast period — *Bajráam* (بیرام).

bákál grocer — *bakkál* (بقال).

bákar copper — *bakýr* (باقر).

bárem at least — *barém* (بارم).

bárjak flag; metathesis for *bájrak*, q. v.

bárut gunpowder — *barút* (باروت).

básamak step; stair — *basamák* rung of ladder (باسدمق).

**bášča*, or *bašta* garden — *báĵče* (باغچه).

**báščovan*, or *baštoven* gardener — *baĵčebán* (باغچوان).

**bátal* spoiled — *battál* (بatal).

Beg Bey (title) — *Bey* (Beg) (بك).

berbérin barber — *berbér* (بربر).

bíljur lamp-chimney — *billúr* crystal (بللور).

**bímbaša* colonel — *bímbaši* major (بکباشی).

bója colour; paint — *boy* (بوی).

**bóstán* garden; vegetables — *bostán* (بوستان).

búdala fool — *búdalá* idiot (بوداله).

burázer ^s pal; companion — *bíradér* brother (TP برادر).

- burgíja* gimlet — *burǵý* (بورغى).
 **búzdovan* cudgel; mace — *bozdoǵán* (بوزطغان).
búza sour fermented beverage of rice or corn — *bóza* fermented millet (بوزه).
 **budžák* corner (the inner part) — *budžák* (بجاق).
budžaklǐja pettifogger; from *budžak* = one who slinks about in corners.

Ć

- ćása* dish — *kʷáse* basin (كاسه).
ćebe blanket — *kʷébe* felt; *serge* (كبد).
ćeváp chop — *kʷebáb* (كباب).
ćéhlubar (*ćéliḡar*) amber — *kahrubár*; *kehlíbá(r)* (كهربا).
ćilim carpet — *kilim* (كليم).
ćóšak corner — *kʷóšé* (كوشه).
ćúmur coal — *kʷümúr* (كومور).
ćúprija small bridge — *kʷröprü* bridge (كوبرى).

Č

- čak* only — *čak* (چق).
čálma ⁵ turban — *čalmá* (چالمه); not current Osmanli, which is *sarik* (صارق).
čának bowl — *čának* (چناق).
čamašir linen goods; underclothes — *čamašir* (چماشير).
 **čárdak* terrace — *čardák* (چارداق).
čársaf coverlet — *čaršáb(f)* (چارشب).
čáršija market — *čaršý* (چارشى).
čélík steel — *čélík* (چلك).
čéngel hook — *čéngel* (چنگل).
čéta troop; guard — *čete* band of brigands (چيده = gathering).
čitluk farm — *čiftlik* (چفتلك).
čizma shoe — *čizmé* boot (چزمه).
čóbān shepherd — *čobán* (چبان).
čok much; many — *čok* (چوق).
čúruk rotten (indeclinable) — *čürük* (چوروك).

D

- déva* camel — *deve* (دوه).
démír iron grating — *demír* iron (تیمور).
dérviš dervish — *derviš* (درویش).
dírek mast; pole — *dirék* (دیرک).
divān sofa — *diván* (دیوان).
**divánija* madman — *divané* (دیوانه).
dīn faith; religion — *dīn* (دین).
**doláf* cupboard — *doláb* (طولاب) or *dulab*.
**dómūz* pig; hog cholera — *domúz* (طوگزر).
**dúduk* flageolet; fife — *dūdúk* (دودك).
dúcān shop — *dukʻán* (دكان).
dúhān (*duvan*) tobacco — *dukhán* (دخان smoke).

Dj

- djáūr* infidel — *gʻaúr* (كافر; pr. *gʻaūr*).
djōn boot-sole — *djōn* (جون).
**djuls* rose-water — *gʻül* rose (كل صويي = rose water).

Dž

- džámija* } mosque — *žámī* (جامع).
džamija }
**džévher* jewel — *ževhér* (جوهر).
džēp } pocket — *žēb* (جيب).
djep }
džérdan (*djerdan*) necklace — *gʻverdenlík* (گردنلك).
džehénem Hell — *žehánnum* (جهنم).
džígérica } liver — *žigér* (چگر).
djígérica }
**džīn* evil spirit — *žinn* familiar spirit (جنّ).
džúmbuš friendly row; happy party — *žunbúš* (جنبش).

E

- evlád* children — *evlád* (اولاد).
ezán call to prayer (Moslem) — *azán* (اذان).

éjvalah my God — *éjvallah* (ای والله).

ékser nail — *eksér* (اکسر).

efendíja sir; Mr. (postpositive) — *eféndi* (افندی).

**ěšek* ass — *ešék* (اشك).

F

**férmān* decree, ukase — *firmān* (فرمان).

finđjān cup — *finǰān* (فنجان)*.

fišek cartridge — *fišék* (فشك).

fitilj wick — *fitil* (فتيل).

G

gúzija leader — *ǰāzī* (غازی) = religious champion.

H

**háber* news — *khábér* (خبر).

**hádum* servant — *khadým* (خادم)*.

**háir ola* may it be well — (خير اولا).

**hájvān* animal — *hajván* (حيوان).

hájduk robber — *hajdúd* (حيدود).

hámal porter — *hammál* (حمال).

hámam Turkish bath — *hammám* (حمام)*.

**hān inn* — *khān* (خان).

hándžar dagger — *khanchár* (خنجر)*.

**hānum* lady — *khānǔm* (خانم).

haps prison — *habs* (حبس); whence the common verb *u(h)ápsiti* arrest.

**harám* accursed, forbidden — *harām* (حرام).

haramíja criminal — *harāmí* thief (A حرامي).

haráč tribute — *kharáč* (خراج)*.

**harb* war — *harb* (A حرب).

hárdal mustard — *khardál* (خردل).

hárem harem — *harém* (حرم).

hádjija pilgrim — *háǰǰi* (حجّی)*.

**hesáb* account; bill — *hisáb* (حساب).

- **hécím* physician — *hakím* (حكيم).
hódja teacher (religious) — *khódja* (خواجه).

I

- ibrik* ewer — *ibrik* (إبريق).
imám chief; religious leader — *imám* (امام).
**insān* person; human being — *insān* (انسان).
**indjil* Gospel — *injl* (انجيل)*.
Islām Muhammadanism — *islām* (اسلام).
**išaret* sign — *išarét* (اشارت).

J

- **jabándjija* foreigner — *jabanǰi* (يپانجي)*.
**jázuk* a pity — *jazýk* (يازق)*.
**jálān* a lie — *jalān* (يلان).
jaláh O God — *ja Alláh* (ياالله).
**jāngíja* fire; conflagration — *janǰin* (يانجين).
jarak ditch; pit — *jarýk* a split; crack (يارق)*.
járamāz good-for-nothing fellow — *jaramáz* (يرامز).
jásak prohibition — *jasák* forbidden (يساق).
jástuk pillow — *jastýk* (ياصدق)*.
jášmak woman's veil — *jašmák* (ياشماق).
játagan curved sabre — *jataǰán* (يتاغان).
**játak* bed; couch — *jāták* (يتاق).
jége file; rasp — *ége* (اكه).
**jélek* waistcoat — *jélek* (يلك).
**jemín* oath — *jemín* (يمين).
jenǰiçar janissary — *jen(g)ičeri* (يڭيچري).
jok no; there is none — *jok* (يوق).
**jol* road — *jol* (يول).
**jöldáš* travelling companion — *joldáš* (يولداش).
**jöldjija* traveller — *jolǰi* (يولجي)*.
jörgān coverlet — *jorǰán* (يورغان).
júriti to rush ahead — *jürümék* run (يوريمك).

K

kábza hilt (also *kamza*) — *kabzá*; *kamzá* (قبضه).

kávga quarrel; brawl — *kavǵá* (غوغا).

kádar energetic; capable — *kadár* (قدر).

**káik* skiff; boat — *kayík* (قایق).

kájmak cream — *kajmák* clotted cream (قیماق).

**kálaüz* finger-post — *kilaǵúz* guide (قلاغوز).

kaldırma pavement (*trottoir*) — *kaldırým* (قالدریم)*.

**kálem* reed; Turkish pen — *kalém* (قلم).

kálfa khalifa; assistant — *khalifé* (خلیفه).

kalp bad (money) — *kalp* (قالب).

kálpak high fur cap — *kalpák* (قلپاق).

kálup model; form — *kalýp* (قالب)*.

kámza (see *kabza*) hilt — *kabzá* (قبضه).

kánát interest; savings — *kanát* satisfaction (قناعت); also S verb *kanát-iti* to save.

kántar scales; steelyard — *kantár* (قنطار).

kándža claw; talon — *kanǵa* boat hook (قانه)*.

kápak shutter; eyelid — *kapák* (قیپاق).

kápija door — *kapý* (قپو)*.

kára black (in combination) — *kará* (قره).

karaúla sentry — *karaǵól* (قره غول).

kářišik medley; compound — *karyšýk* (قارشق)*.

kárpüz watermelon — *karpúz* (قارپوز).

kaftán skirt — *kaftán* (قفتان).

kašika spoon — *kašýk* (قاشق)*.

kāt storey; floor — *kāt* (قات).

kázān kettle — *kazǵān*, *kazān* (قزغان).

kázāz silk-maker — *kazzáz* (قزاز).

kázuk stake, pole — *kazýk* (قازق)*.

késa purse — *késé* (کیسه).

kiradjija tenant; rent payer — *kiraǵi* (کراجی)*.

kirija rent — *kira* (کرا).

- **kódja* man; fellow — *kóĵa* husband (قوجا).
kómšija neighbour — *komšú* (قوڭشى).
kónāk dwelling — *konāk* barracks; residence (قوناق).
kópča hook — *kopčá* (قويچە).
**kóvān* beehive — *kovān* (قوان).
**kóvanluk* beehive — *kovanlýk* (قوانلىق)*.
kúla castle — *kál'á* (قلعه) also *kule*.
kútija box — *kutú* (قوتى).
kúšāk belt; girdle — *kušák* (قوشاق).

L

- **lédžen* washhandstand — *lég^{ven}*, *léyen* (لكن).
lepáza (*lepeza*) fan — *jélpazé* (يلپازە).
lúla pipe; tube — *lūlé* (لوله).

M

- májden* ore — *ma'dén* (معدن).
májmūn monkey — *majmún* (ميمون).
**māl* landed property — *māl* (مال).
mángāl brazier — *mangál* (منقال).
mašálah welcome; hail — *mašalláh* (ماشالله).
médresa college; high school — *médressé* (مدرسه).
mégdan (*májdan*) square; open space — *megdán mejdán* (ميدان).
**mélun* cursed — *ma'lún* (ملعون).
**mémur* official — *me'múr* (مامور).
**mérđžān* coral — *merĵān* (مرجان)*.
**mízrak* spear — *mizrák* (مزراق).
mírāz inheritance — *mirás* (ميراث).
**mísir* Egypt — *mýsýr* (مصر)*.
múhur seal (of letter) — *mühr* (مهر).
múla Moslem teacher — *móllā* (مولا).
munára minaret — *minaré* (منارة).
**munásib* suitable; proper — *munasíb* (مناسب).
múslimān Moslem — *muslimān* (مسلمان).

mútvak kitchen — *mútbakh* (مطبخ).
múftija Moslem judge; Mufti — *múfti* (مفتی).
muštérija customer — *muštéri* (مشتري).

N

**námāz* prayer — *namāz* canonical prayer (نماز).
nasúliti pacify — from *sulh* (صلح) = peace.
**níšador* sal ammoniac — *nišadýr* (نشادر)*.
níšān mark; target — *nišān* (نشان).
**nizām* order; rule — *nizām* (نظام).

O

ódaja room — *óda* (اوده).
óžak chimney — *ožāk* (اوجاق)*.

P

pázar bazar; market — *pāzār* (پازار).
pazáriti buy — from *pāzār* market.
pándža claw; talon — *pénjě* (پنجه)*.
papúča Turkish slipper — *papúš* or *pabúš* (پاپوش).
páša general — *pāšā* (پاشا).
pekméz juice of fruit boiled thickly — *pekméz* from (پکشمک =
 bake).
péksimet hard biscuit — *peksemét* (پکسمات).
péndžér(a) window (usually S *prozor*) — *pénjere* (پنجره).
**perde* curtain — *perdé* (پرده).
péhlivān athlete; clown — *pehluvān* wrestler (پهلوان).
peškír towel — *peškír* napkin (پشکیر).
pilāv chicken pilaff — *piláf* (پللو).
pirínač rice — *pirínj* (پرنج)*.

R

**rāja* Christian peasant under Turkish rule; ward — *ri'áya* (رعایا);
réis Moslem chief — *re's* (رئس).

S

- **sáčma* small shot; nonsense — *sáčma* (صاچمه).
sadžak tripod; stand — *sāj-ajak* (ساج-ایاق)*.
sáfrān crocus — *zaferān* safron (زعفران).
sáhan dish — *sahn* (صحن).
sákat cripple — *sakát* (سکت).
sánduk box; trunk — *sandúk* (سندق).
**sarāj* palace — *sarāj* (سرای).
seis running groom; groom — *se'is* (سئس).
selám greeting — *selám* (سلام).
selámet health; welfare — *selamét* (سلامت).
sépet basket — *sépéd* (سید).
**sérasker* general-in-chief — *seraskér* (سرعسكر).
sérdar general-in-chief — *sirdár* (سردار).
símit white bread — *simít* (سمیت).
**sičān* mouse; also = arsenic (mouse poison) — *sičān* mouse (صچان).
sókak small street; alley — *sokák* street (صوقاق).
spáhija soldier; *spahi* — P *sipáhi* (سپاهی).
súndjer sponge — *sung'ér* (سونگر).

S

- **Šām* Damascus — *Šām* (شام).
šámār box on the ear — *šamār* (شمار).
šégrt student — *šagírd* (شاگرد).
šérbe sherbet — *šerbét* (شربه).
šécer sugar — *šek'ér* (شکر).
šēh sheikh — *šekh* (شیخ).
šéshāna rifle — *šéshkhané* (شنخانده).
šímšir box-tree — *čimšir* (چمشیر).
súćur thanks (to God) — *šuk'ür* (شکر).

T

- tábak* sheet; printer's galley — *tabakú* (طبقة).
**tákrum* set; outfit — *tak'ým* (طاقم)*.

- **tāmām* exact — *tamām* (تمام).
 **tamām-iti* arrange; set in order, from *tamām*.
tárpoš fez; high cap — *tarbūš* A (طربوش).
taván attic — *taván* (طوان).
tavánica ceiling; from *taván*.
téfter blank-book; ledger — *deftér* (دفتر).
télal auctioneer — *delál* (دلال).
térzija tailor — *térzi* (درزی).
téskera document (official) — *tézkeré* passport (تذكرة).
téstera saw — *tésteré* (دستاره).
tésterač sawyer — from *téstera*.
 **terterívan* litter between mules — *táhtiraván* (تختروان).
 **tízluk* legging; gaiter — *dízlík* (ديرك), from *diz* = knee.
tókmak mallet — *tokmák* (طوقمق).
top cannon — *top* (طوب).
 **tópál* lame — *topál* (طوبال).
 **tutundjija* tobacconist; = *duhanjija* — *tütünji* (تنونجي)*.
tuč bronze — *tunč*, *tuč* (توج).

U

útiija tailor's goose — *utú* (اوتي).

V

- vákuf* entailed ecclesiastical property — *vakf* (وقف).
Valáh My God! — *Valláh* (والله).
 **vézír* assistant — *vezír* minister (وزير).
vilájet province — *vilajét* (ولايت).

Z

- **zábit* commander; officer — *zabít* (ضابط).
zánāt trade; handicraft — *san'át* (صنعت).
zéjtín oil — *zetín* (زيتين).
zémбилj basket; hamper — *zenbil* (زنбил).

* *Čalma* turban, as indicated above, is not a standard Turkish word and is unknown in western Turkey to-day. It has passed over through Russian *čalma*, Bulgarian *čálma*, into Magyar *csálma* (pr. *čólmó*), whence it probably came into Serbo-Croatian.

A NEW INSCRIPTION OF ENTEMENA *

GEORGE A. BARTON


UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE FOLLOWING document is inscribed on some cones belonging to Edgar J. Banks of Eustis, Florida. Dr. Banks kindly loaned the writer two of the copies with permission to publish the inscription. The points of both cones which the writer has seen are broken away, but the portion containing the inscription is intact on both of them. One of them is $4\frac{5}{8}$ inches long, the head is 3 inches in diameter and the smaller end $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches in diameter. The other cone is $4\frac{3}{4}$ inches long, 3 inches in diameter at the head, and $1\frac{3}{4}$ inches in diameter at the smaller end.

This inscription gives us information of a hitherto unknown ruler of Erech, Lugalkinishududu, who was a contemporary of Entemena of Lagash. A ruler of Erech named Lugalkigubnidudu, who called himself king, has been known ever since Hilprecht published the second part of his *Old Babylonian Inscriptions*, 1896, but we do not know where to place him chronologically. The similarity of his name with that of Lugalkinishududu would suggest that they were of the same family and probably ruled Erech at not a great distance from each other in time. Lugalkigubnidudu was, however, free; he calls himself king; but Lugalkinishududu was a subject of another; he does not call himself king. The discovery of this new ruler, however, makes it probable that Lugalkigubdudu was also a contemporary of the dynasty of Lagash.

* Since this article left the hands of the writer a clipping has been sent him from *The Christian Science Monitor* of May 6th, 1931, containing a dispatch from Chicago, to the effect that the above inscription exists also on a stone which has been added to the private library of Mr. J. L. Kraft of Chicago. It would seem that Mr. Kraft obtained the stone from the owner of these cones. In his correspondence with the writer Dr. Banks said nothing about the stone, but said that, as his cuneiform was rusty, he would be grateful for a rendering of the inscription. As he had granted liberty of publication, an advance copy of the translation was sent him. The clipping just mentioned states that "Dr. Edgar J. Banks, archaeologist, and Dr. George A. Barton of the University of Pennsylvania, translated the inscription"!

TEXT



- i, 1. *dininni-ra*
2. *dugal-sa-bar-ininni-ra*
3. *en-te-me-na*
4. *pa-te-si*
5. *šir-la-purki-gè*

- i, 1. To Ininni (and)
2. to Lugalsabar-ininni
3. Entemena,
4. *patesi*
5. of Lagash

- | | |
|--|---|
| 6. <i>ê-ininni ê ki-àg-ne-ne</i> | 6. E-ininni, the temple which they love, |
| 7. <i>mu-na-rú</i> | 7. built. |
| 8. <i>kib mu-na¹-gù²</i> | 8. (its) fullness (i. e., 'full equipment'?) ³ he commanded. |
| 9. <i>en-te-me-na</i> | 9. Entemena |
| 10. <i>lù ê-ininna rú-a</i> | 10. is he who built E-ininni. |
-
- | | |
|---|--|
| ii, 1. <i>dingir-ra-ni</i> | ii, 1. His god is |
| 2. <i>^ddun-muš(?) dingir</i> | 2. Dun-mush(?), the divine. |
| 3. <i>uđ-ba en-te-me-na</i> | 3. At that time Entemena, |
| 4. <i>pa-te-si</i> | 4. <i>patesi</i> |
| 5. <i>šir-la-pur^{ki}</i> | 5. of Lagash, |
| 6. <i>lugal-ki-ni-šù-dū-dū</i> | 6. and Lugalkinishududu, |
| 7. <i>pa-te-si</i> | 7. <i>patesi</i> |
| 8. <i>unug^{ki}-bi</i> | 8. of Erech |
| 9. <i>nam-šeš e-ag</i> | 9. made brotherhood; (i. e., formed a treaty). |

The last line of the inscription, containing the statement that Entemena and Lugalkinishududu effected brotherhood, is interesting. The writer does not recall in all his reading of Sumerian inscriptions having come across the same phrase *nam-šeš* in such a connection. Erech was, as we know from many indications, a Semitic center. Its name is one of the few Babylonian city names which, from earliest times, bore a designation which has a good Semitic etymology. It has long been known that the Semitic method of forming a treaty was to enter into an artificial brotherhood. It seems probable, therefore, that in this phrase we have the emergence of a Semitic idea.

The god Lugalsabar-ininni is also a hitherto unknown Babylonian deity. The god Lugalsapar,⁴ the last syllable of whose name expressed by a different cuneiform sign from that used in our name,

¹ Variant, *ne*.

² Or, *mu-na-gü*.

³ *Kib* is here a puzzling expression. Literally it means, 'overflow', or 'plain'; see the writer's *Babylonian Writing*, no. 223. It can also mean 'Everything'; see Deimel, *Lexicon*, no. 228².

⁴ See A. Deimel's *Pantheon Babylonicum*, no. 1990.

is found in C.T. 2539 (K 2098, OBV. 3), but that name is not coupled with the name Ininni. It seems probable that Ininni here is implied as a Sumerian equivalent to the Ishtar of Erech, and that Lugalsapar-ininni is here an epithet of Ishtar's son or consort Dumuzi. If this conjecture is correct, Entemena signalized the treaty of brotherhood with the ruler of Erech by erecting at Erech a Temple to the deities of that city.

THE CITATORY ELEMENT IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE YEN T'IEH LUN

ESSON M. GALE
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

A STUDY of the composition of the *Yen t'ieh lun* 鹽鐵論,¹ the surviving work of the early Han literatus Huan K'uan 桓寬, discloses a valuable deposit of material² indicative of the literary resources available to the Chinese writer of the first century before the Christian era. The intellectual backgrounds of the Confucian school of the moment are made clear. This is especially favored by the Chinese predilection for quotation and allusion, a propensity from which even such an early writer as Huan K'uan was not free. Our own medieval scholastics, to be sure, such as the twelfth century John of Salisbury, "well read in the Latin writers" accessible in his time,³ quote their classical predecessors freely; while even Milton, of a much later epoch, owed much of his perfection of literary finish to the wealth of classical metaphor and allusion which adorn especially his earlier works.

Few European writers, however, have equalled in resourcefulness and versatility the literary giants of China who could at will dig down into the literature of all preceding time and extract an historical or literary similitude to round out their thought. With its rewards by way of public office, the educational system of China, founded in Han Wu Ti's time (140-87 B. C.),⁴ demanding that the canonical literature be learned *verbatim*, doubtless accounts for the mnemonic feats of Chinese authors. But stereotyped and dogmatic quotation, introduced rather to adorn the tale than to point the moral, makes its appearance particularly since the Middle

¹ E. M. Gale, "Historical Evidences Relating to Early Chinese Public Finance," in *Proceedings of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association*, 1929, pp. 48-62.

² Cf. Appendix.

³ C. H. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, Harvard University Press, 1927, p. 100.

⁴ L. Wieger, *Textes Historiques*, Hochienfu, 1903, Tome I, p. 465, *ap. Han Shu*. For the successive Imperial ordinances relating to scholarship promulgated by the early Han emperors, cf. E. Biot, *Essai sur l'Histoire de l'Instruction publique en Chine*, Paris, 1845, p. 135 seq.

Han period, together with cadenced sentence and topical parallelism, for form's sake alone. Such early Han writers as Chia I 賈誼 or Ch'ao Ts'ao 晁錯, and their successor Tung Chung-shu 董仲舒,⁵ are not found to affect the quotation for its mystical potency.

It is scarcely possible to make an exhaustive examination of the borrowed material, the *bagage littéraire*, of Huan K'uan in his sixty chapters. For to identify with certainty unacknowledged quotations would postulate a ready acquaintance with all literature of China prior to Hsüan Ti's 宣帝 time (73-49 B. C.), during which this author flourished.⁶ Sufficient are the some one hundred and twenty-nine direct citations from at least twenty different sources. These, to be sure, frequently represent deviations from the present-day texts.⁷ In the *Yen t'ieh lun* it is noteworthy that about four-fifths (over ninety) of the quotations emanate from the side of the Confucian literati, the *Hsien-liang* 賢良 and *Wên-hsüeh* 文學.⁸ Of the entire number, thirty citations are identified as from the *Lun yü* 論語, to which may be added seven ascribed generally to K'ung Tzū 孔子. Ten are from *Mêng tzū* 孟子; thirty-three from the *Shih Ching* and eighteen from the *Ch'un ch'iu* (9) 春秋 and its commentaries (9) 傳. The remaining represent direct quotations from the *I Ching* (6) 易經, the *Shang shu* (2) 尚書 (*Shu ching* 書經), T'ai Kung (1) 太公, Kuan Tzū (4) 管子, Lao Tzū (3) 老子, Yen Tzū (1) 晏子, Kung-sun Lung (1) 公孫龍, Lu Lien (1) 魯連, (Lu Chung-lien 魯仲連), Yang Tzū (1) 楊子 (Yang Chu

⁵ "... lettré savant, gardien de la doctrine orthodoxe, prêcheur sévère de la morale ..." G. Margouliès, *Évolution de la prose artistique chinoise*, München, 1929, p. 56. For the analysis of Tung Chung-shu's personality and his literary work, see O. Franke, *Studien zur Geschichte des konfuzianischen Dogmas und der chinesischen Staatsreligion*, Hamburg, 1920, Pt. II, and W. Seufert, "Urkunden zur staatlichen Neuordnung unter der Han-Dynastie," in *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen*, Berlin, 1922.

⁶ Preface of Hung Chih 弘治 ed. of the *Yen t'ieh lun*.

⁷ On the provenience and authenticity of ante-Han texts, cf., for example, Professor H. Maspero's discussion on the extant *Kuan Tzū* in *Journal Asiatique*, Tome CCX, 1927, pp. 144-52, also his bibliographical notes, *La Chine Antique*.

⁸ For the definition of these terms, cf. Biot, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

楊朱), Sun Tzū (1) 孫子 (? Hsün Tzū 荀子), Han Tzū (1) 韓子 (Han Fei 韓非), Chia I (1) 賈生, and Ssü-ma Ch'ien (1) 司馬遷. These are all introduced by 曰, 云, 言, or 有言. Seven are ascribed to popular sayings 語鄙語.

A number of personages are mentioned in the text but with no citations from the works usually attributed to them. We look in vain for the name of the brilliant Chuang Tzū. The perhaps apocryphal Su Ch'ín 蘇秦⁹ and Chang I 張儀, whose speeches enliven the *Chan kuo ts'ê* 戰國策 and are repeated in the *Shih chi* 史記,¹⁰ are made to appear in the *mise en scène* but provide nothing for the argument. Tung-fang So 東方朔 is mentioned twice, but not Tung Chung-shu, and neither are quoted. A chapter for each is devoted to Shang Yang 商鞅 and Ch'ao Ts'o¹¹ but no citations appear from the works accredited to them. Neither the *Chan kuo ts'ê*, the *Han shih wai chuan* 韓詩外傳, nor the *Kuo yü* 國語 is cited by name. Yet the six hundred and twenty-five authors and their works listed in the bibliographical section of the *Han shu* indicate the enormous volume of literature which may have been available to Huan K'uan. There are accordingly interesting and unexplained lacunae in the citations.

Various conclusions may be drawn from this by no means definitive survey. The author's later editors take it that "he enlarged upon and expanded the ideas set forth in the debate in order to form a school of thought."¹² We are to lay aside, then, the supposition that the compilation is a verbatim report, recorded by Huan K'uan at the time of the great forum of 81 B. C. On the one hand, accordingly, it may be assumed that the compiler of the *Lun* had access to no other material than the authorities actually cited in his text. Many works had been destroyed in the first "bibliothecal catastrophe," the holocaust of literature instigated by Ch'ín Shih Huang Ti's minister Li Ssü (213 B. C.). During the disorders which followed the fall of the Ch'ín house, the struggle between Han and Ch'u, most of the great cities were burned.

⁹ H. Maspero, "Le Roman de Sou Ts'in," in *Etudes Asiatiques*, Tome II; also in *La Chine Antique*, Paris, 1927, pp. 588-589.

¹⁰ *Chan kuo ts'ê*, ch. III et passim; *Shih chi*, chs. LXIX, LXX; F. Hübötter, *Aus den Plänen der kämpfenden Reiche*, 1912.

¹¹ *Yen t'ieh lun*, chs. VII and VIII.

¹² *Yen t'ieh lun*, Hung Chih ed., preface.

These were the seats of the feudal princes, many of whom as literary Maecenases, such as the later Liu Teh, Prince of Ho-chien 劉德河間王, had made collections of books. The countryside, too, was ravaged by the armies of the generals contending for the empire.

Only a century or less before Huan K'uan, the law for the suppression of literary works was formally repealed (190 B. C.). Despite vigorous efforts made to recover the ancient writings, even towards the close of the first century B. C. many works were still wanting and others incomplete. It remained for Liu Hsiang 劉向 and his son Liu Hsin 劉歆 to restore the national library as represented in the catalogue of the *Han Shu*. Even if works lay buried in the Imperial archives, as appears to have been the case of the *Tso chuan* 左傳,¹³ Huan K'uan unlike the Grand Astrologer Ssü-ma Ch'ien and his successor the Archivist Liu Hsin, may not have gained access to them, even while residing at the capital as a *lang* 郎. Later as a provincial *t'ai shou ch'êng* 太守丞¹⁴ at Lu Chiang 廬江¹⁵ the presumption is that he would be without easy access even to standard material.

On the other hand, with a voluminous and varied literature already in existence and accessible, the author seems more likely to have restricted his references to such works as were immediately pertinent to his argument. Quotation for quotation's sake had not yet become the literary vogue. Moreover as an adherent of the Confucian school, he would defer to those works which, while not yet formally elevated to the *Canon*, were the only primary sources from which to draw lofty moral precepts and sound principles of government. The Confucian scholar disdained to make use of the non-canonical writers who "at times deny the teachings of the classics and criticize the sages, and at times glorify spiritual beings and gods and put faith in prodigies."¹⁶ This explains the paucity of quotations or complete disregard of the writings of the economic and jurist school, such as represented by Kuan Tzŭ, Shang Yang,

¹³ E. Chavannes, *Les Mémoires Historiques de Se-ma Ts'ien*, Paris, 1895, Tome I, p. cxcic, ap. *Han Shu*.

¹⁴ *Lang*, "chamberlain, page"; *t'ai shou ch'êng*, "second administrative officer in a province of the Empire, deputy governor."

¹⁵ Cf. Preface to the Hung Chih ed. of the *Yen t'ieh lun*.

¹⁶ *Han shu*, ch. LXXX, p. 7 r., quoted by Chavannes, *loc. cit.*

and Han Fei Tzŭ, the works attributed to whom were in circulation in Ssü-ma Ch'ien's time.¹⁷

Huan K'uan was steeped in the *Kung-yang* commentary 公羊傳¹⁸ of the *Ch'un ch'iu*.¹⁹ Hence after the apostolic *Shih ching* and *Lun yü* the greatest number of references attach to this work, which so engrossed the earlier Han scholars. Seven of the quotations assigned to the *Ch'un ch'iu* derive from the famous commentary itself, proof that Huan K'uan did not forget the study of his youth. None of the ascriptions to the *Chuan* 傳 seem to be derived from the *Tso chuan*, although the *Han shu*²⁰ indicates that the latter was in circulation in Ching Ti's time (156-141 B. C.). With four-fifths of the quotations belonging to the Confucian bibliography, and half of these from the *Shih ching* and the *Lun yü*, these two works thus already appear to have formed the vade mecum of the scholar of the time. Contrasted with the seeming carelessness in other directions, both of these works are quoted on the whole accurately and faithfully.²¹

¹⁷ *Shih chi*, chaps. LXII, LXVIII; J. J. L. Duyvendak, *The Book of Lord Shang*, London, 1928, pp. 31, 131 seq.; *Han shu*, chap. VI, under 1st year of Wu Ti.

¹⁸ "... the dry-as-dust and stale moralizing of Ku-liang and Kung-yang . . . the real representatives of the Confucian tradition . . . predominant in the centre of the national studies. . . ." B. Karlgren, *On the Authenticity and Nature of the Tso chuan*, Göteborg, 1926, p. 9, passim; O. Franke, *op. cit.*, pp. 56-86.

¹⁹ *Chung kuo ming jen ta tz'ü tien*, p. 812: 治公羊春秋.

²⁰ *Loc. cit.*, ch. LIII. Karlgren's masterly discussion serves to prove the existence of the *Tso chuan* in Ssü-ma Ch'ien's time, the text of which the latter paraphrased in the *Shih chi*. *op. cit.*, p. 29. Thus it was in existence when Huan K'uan wrote. The identification of the quotations from the *Ch'un ch'iu* and its(?) *Chuan*'s presents a particularly difficult problem. It seems as if the text of the *Kung-yang* commentary in Huan K'uan's time differed somewhat from the modern one. This may possibly explain why so few of the quotations can be found in the present text. On the other hand, the term *Chuan*, especially as prefixed to longer quotations that are not in the terse style of Kung-yang might possibly refer to some other "Record" or "Commentary" unknown to us. It is likewise to be noted that Huan K'uan often quotes a passage as coming from the *Ch'un ch'iu* whereas it is obviously a gloss. This intricate problem is closely linked with the great *Ch'un ch'iu*-Frage and would require special investigation.

²¹ It is to be noted that most of the garbled or mislabelled quotations are put by Huan K'uan into the mouth of the representatives of the

It is a striking fact that Huan K'uan's work reveals only one direct quotation from the monumental compilation of his immediate predecessor, and in part at least contemporary, the historiographer Ssü-ma Ch'ien. Too, the quotation is placed in the mouth of the *yü shih ta fu* 御史大夫,²² Sang Hung-yang 桑弘羊,²³ who speaks of his authority as Ssü-ma Tzū 司馬子. Precisely what the unusual terminal appellation implies is by no means easy to construe. The *tzū*, to be sure, is applied to the philosophers, and is a prefix denoting the "master" or "teacher." It no longer held its significance as a title of the feudal nobility in the Han era, although the Grand Astrologer made claim to derive his ancestry from an aristocratic house.²⁴ Employed by the *yü shih ta fu*, a contemporary and doubtless a personal acquaintance of the historian, it may represent a form of respectful address, as it commonly was in later centuries, and here it is applied to one of the official hierarchy to which both belonged.²⁵ But the fact that Ssü-ma Ch'ien was enough of an historian to be an adherent of none of the special schools, could make him an object of suspicion to such a Confucian stalwart as Huan K'uan.

The great historiographer's death has been determined as occurring at the beginning of the reign of Chao Ti 昭帝 (86-74 B. C.).²⁶ Thus it is probable that his life terminated shortly before the logomachy of the second lunar month of 81 B. C. Had the *Shih chi* been accessible to Huan K'uan, and had he chosen to make use of it, he would have had at hand a veritable thesaurus of material upon which to draw, even had he had no other library facilities. Ssü-ma Ch'ien himself records that he placed one copy of his work

"Government party", either out of malice or to indicate the contempt in which the parvenus of the time held the Confucian literature.

²² Third highest rank in the Empire. This high minister was in charge of the *yü shih fu* 御史府, the State Chancellery; "Grand Secretary", later "Censor General."

²³ E. M. Gale, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-59.

²⁴ "... le nom de famille Se-ma fut donné, disaient-ils, aux descendants de Fou P'ou, comte de Tch'eng, quand ils perdirent leur fief sous le règne de Siuen (827-782 av. J. C.), roi de la dynastie Teheou." Chavannes, *op. cit.*, Tome I, p. xii.

²⁵ Chia I is spoken of as Chia Tzū 賈子 in the *Shih chi*, chap. LXI, "master Chia, recently deceased(?)."

²⁶ An exhaustive discussion on this doubtful point is found in Chavannes, *op. cit.*, Tome I, p. xliv.

—whether on boards or silk rolls, we do not know—in the imperial library, and one at the Capital.²⁷ But the *Shih chi*, in the form completed by its compiler, appears to have been withheld from general publication for reasons of state, until Hsüan Ti's time, to be again withdrawn from public circulation in 28 B. C. Its contents represented material of a heterodox and otherwise dangerous nature, in contemporary opinion.²⁸ Thus only a few privileged persons could have had access to its treasures.

It has been found, on the other hand, that the *Shih chi*, though quoted directly only once by the high officer of state, Sang Hung-yang, yields a number of parallels to Huan's citatory passages. But Huan K'uan's citations, notably in the case of the *Lun yü*, prove to be more faithful to the accepted (i. e. present day) texts than those of the historiographer.²⁹ It has been likewise ascertained that Ssü-ma Ch'ien makes a notably limited use of the *Shih ching*. Only six principal citations from this earliest of extant Chinese literary documents have been noted by Chavannes³⁰ although others are suggested as occurring. Huan K'uan's *Yen t'ieh lun* contains no less than thirty-three direct quotations. It may be concluded that Huan K'uan had available his own armarium, from which his citations were culled; and that by reason of distaste for the historiographer's principles he made little use of Ssü-ma Ch'ien's compendium of earlier literature. It has been possible to note certain general passages in the *Yen t'ieh lun* similar to those found in the *Shih chi*.³¹ This suggests, to be sure, that both writers may have been familiar with the same documents. Yet the occurrence of an actual quotation from Ssü-ma Ch'ien's work, in the words of the historiographer himself,³² would tend to indi-

²⁷ *Shih chi*, ch. CXXX, p. 13 r., noted by Chavannes, *op. cit.*, Tome I, p. cxviii.

²⁸ Chavannes, *loc. cit.*

²⁹ Professor Maspero has noted that Ssü-ma Ch'ien, in quoting ancient texts, very frequently employs the gloss rather than the original. Cf. also Chavannes, *op. cit.*, Tome I, chap. 3, *passim*. I do not believe that this is a matter of variants among the three texts of the *Lun yü*, the various readings having been noted by the commentator Cheng Hsüan 鄭玄. Cf. W. E. Soothill, *The Analects of Confucius*, Intro., p. 73.

³⁰ *Op. cit.*, Tome I, p. cxxxvii.

³¹ One of such important parallels has not escaped the notice of the editors of the *Shih chi*. See Notes to the Ch'ien Lung ed. *Shih chi*, ch. CXXIX. Two other interesting examples can be seen in chaps. VI and XIX of the *Yen t'ieh lun*.

cate that Huan K'uan, nevertheless, was familiar with the *Shih chi*. The caution in its use, however, corroborates the tradition of its contemporary disfavor.

The foregoing examination of Huan K'uan's intellectual background reveals with some certainty this early Han writer's place in the evolution of China's school of letters. He represents, in a word, the beginning of the Chinese scholastic mentality. The time had arrived when the ascendancy of the Confucian bibliography induced the scholars to ignore the non-canonical literature. With even more effectiveness than under the edict of Ch'in, the heterodox writings came under proscription. Immediately before him, Ssü-ma Ch'ien earned the condemnation of his own generation by an indiscriminating eclecticism in the employment of all extant literature. Huan K'uan may thus be regarded as among the first of the writers of China to establish definitively the literary cult of the classics, with its intellectual intolerance and citatory standardization.

APPENDIX

Direct Quotations in the Yen t'ieh lun

The numerals refer to the sections (*chüan*) and pages of Wang Hsien-ch'ien's edition of the *Yen t'ieh lun*. References to the *Lun yü* are to Soothill's edition, *The Analects of Confucius*, Yokohama, 1910. Those to the *Shih ching*, *Shu ching*, and *Mêng tzü* are to J. Legge, *Chinese Classics*. Asterisks (*, **, ***) following the *Yen t'ieh lun* references designate various degrees of discrepancy between the citations and present-day texts.

I. Quotations from the *Lun yü*:

Y. T. L.	I, 1 b	<i>Lun yü</i>	XVI, 1, 10	Y. T. L.	V, 2 b **	<i>Lun yü</i>	XVIII, 2
	I, 2 a	<i>ib.</i>	XVI, 1, 11		V, 5 b	<i>ib.</i>	VI, 23
	I, 8 a *	<i>ib.</i>	XIX, 7		V, 5 b	<i>ib.</i>	V, 9
	II, 10 a	<i>ib.</i>	IX, 8		V, 8 a **	<i>ib.</i>	IX, 29
	II, 11 a	<i>ib.</i>	XIII, 3		V, 9 a	<i>ib.</i>	III, 4
	II, 11 b	<i>ib.</i>	XVII, 7		V, 9 b	<i>ib.</i>	IV, 25
	II, 13 a ***	<i>ib.</i>	XV, 39		V, 11 a **	<i>ib.</i>	II, 7
	II, 13 a	<i>ib.</i>	IX, 3		V, 13 b	<i>ib.</i>	XI, 16
	III, 2 b	<i>ib.</i>	IV, 13		VI, 8 b ***	<i>ib.</i>	VIII, 4
	III, 5 b	<i>ib.</i>	XII, 9		VI, 12 a	<i>ib.</i>	VIII, 10
	IV, 3 a	<i>ib.</i>	VI, 9		VI, 12 a	<i>ib.</i>	XIX, 19
	IV, 4 b *	<i>ib.</i>	VII, 11		VI, 13 a	<i>ib.</i>	XIII, 9
	IV, 5 b	<i>ib.</i>	XV, 11		VII, 1 a *	<i>ib.</i>	XV, 5
	IV, 8 a *	<i>ib.</i>	XVI, 3		IX, 8 b	<i>ib.</i>	XI, 11
	IV, 8 b-9 a	<i>ib.</i>	XVII, 5		X, 10 a	<i>ib.</i>	XII, 13

** The *Yen t'ieh lun* quotation comes from the Preface of ch. CXXIX of the *Shih chi*.

II. Quotations from the *Shih ching*:

Y. T. L.	I, 4 b, 5 b	<i>Shih ching</i>	IV. i. (iii). VI
	I, 9 a	<i>ib.</i>	II. vi. VIII, 3
	I, 12 b-13 a	<i>ib.</i>	II. v. I, 4
	III, 6 b	<i>ib.</i>	II. iii. IV, 3
	III, 7 a	<i>ib.</i>	IV. i. (i). VI
	IV, 1 a	not in <i>Shih ching</i> ? Cf. <i>Mencius</i> , V. i. IV, 2	
	IV, 1 b	<i>Shih ching</i>	I. viii. VII, 1
	V, 4 a	<i>ib.</i>	IV. i. (i). I; III. i. I, 2?
	V, 7 b	<i>ib.</i>	III. iii. I, 7
	V, 10 a	<i>ib.</i>	II. i. IX, 5
	V, 13 a	<i>ib.</i>	III. ii. X, 3
	VI, 1 b	<i>ib.</i>	II. iv. VII, 1
	VI, 3 b	<i>ib.</i>	I. xv. I, 7
	VI, 13 b	<i>ib.</i>	II. vi. VIII, 3
	VII, 4 a	<i>ib.</i>	II. i. VII, 6
	VII, 4 b	<i>ib.</i>	I. i. I, 2
	VII, 5 b	<i>ib.</i>	I. x. VIII, 1
	VIII, 2 b	<i>ib.</i>	I. iii. IX, 3
	VIII, 3 b	<i>ib.</i>	II. iv. VIII, 11
	VIII, 7 b *	<i>ib.</i>	III. iii. II, 5
	VIII, 9 a	<i>ib.</i>	III. iii. II, 8
	VIII, 9 b *	<i>ib.</i>	III. ii. VIII, 1-3
	IX, 1 a	<i>ib.</i>	III. i. X, 6
	IX, 1 a	<i>ib.</i>	II. iii. III, 5; II. i. VIII, 3
	IX, 1 b *	<i>ib.</i>	II. iii. III, 1
	IX, 5 b	<i>ib.</i>	III. ii. IX, 1
	IX, 9 b	<i>ib.</i>	IV. i. (i). IX
	IX, 10 b	<i>ib.</i>	IV. i. (i). VIII
	X, 2 a	<i>ib.</i>	II. v. IX, 1
	X, 4 b	<i>ib.</i>	IV. i. (ii). VII
	X, 5 a	<i>ib.</i>	II. iv. X, 1
	X, 7 a	<i>ib.</i>	II. iv. VIII, 6
	X, 8 b *	<i>ib.</i>	II. v. I, 6

III. Quotations from the *Ch'un ch'iu* and its (?) *Chuan*:

	I, 3 ab	?	
Y. T. L.	I, 10 a	?	
	II, 2 a	not in the <i>Ch'un ch'iu</i> , but in <i>Kung-yang chuan</i> , 桓公 XV	
	II, 5 a	?	
	II, 6 b	<i>Kung-yang chuan</i> , 僖公 XXXI	
	II, 8 a	?	
	III, 4 b	?	
	III, 6 a	?	
	V, 1 b	?	
	V, 12 a	?	
	VII, 2 a	(old saying; cf. <i>Kang hai tzu tien sub</i> 探 ?.)	
	VII, 5 a **	<i>Kung-yang chuan</i> , 僖公 IV	

- IX, 3 a *Ch'un ch'iu*, 莊公 IX; cf. *Kung-yang in loc.*
 IX, 4 a ?
 IX, 6 a not in the *Ch'un ch'iu*, *Kung-yang chuan*, 莊公 XVI
 IX, 9 b not in the *Ch'un ch'iu*, *Kung-yang chuan*, 宣公 XV
 X, 2 b ?
 X, 6 a ** not in the *Ch'un ch'iu*, *Kung-yang chuan*, 成公 XXX

IV. Quotations from *Mêng tzū*:

- Y. T. L. I, 8 ab *** *Mencius* I, I, 3, 3
 II, 11 a *** *Mencius* VI, I, 9, 3
 II, 6 b ?
 V, 12 b *** *Mencius* VI, II, 7
 VI, 14 a *** *Mencius* I, I, 3, 5
 VII, 4 b ?
 VII, 5 a * *Mencius* III, I, 1, 4
 VII, 6 b *ib.* I, I, 2, 5
 VIII, 5 a *Mencius* VI, II, 9, 3
 X, 11 b *ib.* V, I, 8, 4

V. Quotations from sayings of Confucius:

- Y. T. L. I, 8 a ? Y. T. L. VII, 5 a ?
 V, 13 a ? IX, 1 a ? *Chung yung*
 V, 13 a *Hsiao ching*, ch. XV X, 11 a ?
 V, 1 ab ? cf. *Lun hêng*, ch. XXIX, 2

VI. Miscellaneous quotations:

a. *I ching*:

- Y. T. L. I, 2 a 繫辭下. Y. T. L. IX, 4 a 繫辭下
 V, 8 a ? IX, 9 a Hexagram 14
 V, 11 a Hexagram 63 IX, 10 a Hexagram 2

b. *Shu ching*:

- Y. T. L. II, 8 a II. iii. 4 Y. T. L. VI, 7 a V. xiii. 12

c. *Kuan tzū*:

- Y. T. L. I, 2 b ? Y. T. L. VI, 13 a * *Kuan tzū*, ch. I, also ch. LXXX
 I, 8 a ? X, 2 a ** *ibid.*, ch. I

d. *Lao tzū*:

- Y. T. L. I, 2 b ? VIII, 8 a * *Tao teh ching*, ch. L; X, 6 b * *ibid.*, ch. LVII

e.

- T'ai Kung Y. T. L. I, 10 b ?
 Yen Tzū V, 8 b ? cf. *Yen tzū ch'un ch'iu*, 外篇 VIII
 Kung-sun Lung VI, 9 a ?
 Lu Lien IX, 6 b *Chan kuo ts'ê*, ch. XX; *Shih chi*, ch. LXXXIII
 Yang Tzū IV, 3 a ?
 Sun Tzū IX, 7 a ? *Hsün tzū*
 Han Tzū X, 3 a ? *Han fei tzū*; cf. *Shih chi*, ch. LXIII
 Chia Sheng (Chia I) VI, 9 a ?
 Ssu-ma Tzū IV, 6 b *Shih chi*, ch. CXXIX, preface
 Popular sayings III, 1 b; V, 10 a; VI, 9 a; VI, 10 b; VII, 2 a; VII, 8 b;
 VIII, 2 b.

THE INDIAN RHINOCEROS AS A SACRED ANIMAL

GEORGE W. BRIGGS

DREW UNIVERSITY

THE UNICORN and the rhinoceros have occupied a place of importance both in folklore and in religion from the most ancient times to the present.

The unicorn appears as a supporter of the Royal Shield of Great Britain and is known to Shakespeare and Spenser. He belongs to the symbolism of the medieval Church, as the type of Christ and the emblem of purity.¹ In Russian Cossack standards of Ermak (sixteenth century) there appears a horse with a horn (antelope) in its forehead; and in a carved ivory throne, a wedding gift from Byzantium a century earlier, one panel exhibits a horse with one horn (antelope) in the forehead. A Greek manuscript (fifteenth century) of the Proverbs of Solomon and other fragments, including pharmaceutical recipes, has a painting showing the unicorn and depicting a Buddhist story which was brought from India in the seventh century; and a panel in a bronze door (fourteenth century) of the Uspenski Monastery of Aleksandrov depicts the same story. On an ivory casket (eleventh century), in the Kaiser Friedrich Museum in Berlin, of Syro-Egyptian workmanship, a unicorn (an ox) appears among the animal groups. This motif is known in Mycenaean, Byzantine-Coptic, and Perso-Sassanid art. Both the bull and the antelope were early used as interchangeable forms for the same motif. The bull, shown in profile, often appears with one horn, often an antelope horn. Belonging to the early centuries of the Christian era, is the Gallo-Roman discus of silver with its spirited animals in pairs, including the unicorn; and in a wall painting in a grave chamber at Palmyra (third century) likewise. To the pre-Christian millenniums belong numerous representations of the unicorn. A celebrated relief of Cybele (second century B. C.) has along its base a lion and a bull in conflict. (The unicorn is usually found in such association). On either side of the stairway of Artaxerxes Ochus (355-340), at Persepolis, are colossal representations of the lion and the unicorn

¹ The basis for the summary which makes up this and the following paragraph is an article, "The Lion and the Unicorn", by Cyril G. E. Bunt in *Antiquity* for December, 1930.

(bull). The same creature is depicted on Babylonian and Assyrian cylinders, on vases, on seals and on sculptured stones of the epoch of Atrides, and on the tomb of Xanthos. On an ostrich egg from a Phoenician tomb (seventh century) the object (bull) occurs. Coins of Cræsus (sixth century) show the unicorn (bull). On an Egyptian papyrus of Rameses III (c. 1200 B. C.) a lion and a unicorn (ass?) are shown playing at "chess". Still earlier (2250 B. C.) on Babylonian tablets, and on a fragment of a bowl (c. 3000 B. C.) the unicorn (bull) appears. Most interesting of all, perhaps, is the recently discovered checker-board at Ur, composed of fourteen (7 x 2) engraved shell plaques framed with lapis lazuli, showing among the motifs that of the lion and the unicorn in opposition.

It is clear, then, that the symbol of the unicorn is very old. The creature, whether horse, bull, ass, or antelope, is in conflict with the lion. And it has been suggested that the meaning is to be interpreted as seasonal, of spring being overcome by summer, the lion (Leo) triumphing over the bull (Taurus), one-horned. Bunt calls attention, in confirmation of this suggestion, to the *Grande Acedrex*, a modification of the Indian chess, played on a board of 12 x 12 squares, and points out that among the names of the pieces occur both the lion and the unicorn. He mentions also the circular chess game of *Los Escagues*, which consists of seven rings each divided into twelve parts, the "houses" of which are allotted to the signs of the Zodiac.

In pre-historic sites in Europe the remains of man are associated with extinct species of rhinoceros. In the sixteenth century these caves were searched for the horn of the rhinoceros, which was believed to be an antidote to disease.² From the horn were made goblets that were supposed to counteract poison in liquids, and it is said that as late as 1789 such containers were used in court ceremonial in France to test the royal food for poisons.

The rhinoceros is known in China and it is recorded that it was imported for use in the sacrifice by Han Wu Ti. At times nobles had the rhinoceros painted on their chariot wheels.³ Further, in the *China Review*,⁴ the following is reported: "The Sung emperor

² *Encycl. Brit.* (11th Ed.), II. 346.

³ See E. Chauvannes, *Les Mémoires Historiques de Se Ma Ts'ien*. Paris, 1898. Vol. 3, p. 214.

⁴ 1886, p. 359.

was so good a man that he actually gave the people of his capital two rhinoceros horns to be made into medicine to cure cholera, saying (with great truth), 'what do I want with rhinoceros horns?'"

A fabulous, composite beast, called the unicorn, may be traced to the east. Ctesias states that there were in India wild white asses celebrated for their fleetness of foot, having on the forehead a horn a cubit and a half in length, colored white, red, and black. And he remarks, further, that from the horn were made drinking cups which were a preventive of poison. Aelian, quoting Ctesias, reported that India produced also a one-horned horse. And Strabo says that in India there were one-horned horses with stag-like heads.⁵

There are references to the unicorn from the Far East. In Chinese mythology it is the king of all animals and full of gentleness. It is represented with the body of a deer, hoof of a horse, tail of an ox, and as having a single horn with a fleshy growth upon it. Supernatural appearances of this animal are associated with events as far back as 2600 B. C.⁶

Mr. Bertram Thomas, in his description of his journey across Arabia, notes, with reference to the gazelle of Dakaka:

This creature's two horns appear one when seen in profile, and thus it is supposed to have given rise to the ancient myth of the unicorn. This legendary guardian of chastity allowed none but virtuous maidens to approach it, when its anger turned to joy; and singularly today in the southern borderlands, where it is common, almost the only musical instrument known is the pipe made of its horn, and this the Arab maiden plays on the joyful occasion of marriage.⁷

The so-called unicorn ram of the Himalayas is simply a Barwal sheep with the two horns artificially fused by the use of a hot iron while they are budding.⁸

This fabulous beast from the East, may very well, in the beginning, have been a rhinoceros. In a fresco of the third century B. C., found at Marissa (Moreseth, home of Micah), at the tomb

⁵ *Encyl. Brit.* (11th Ed.), XXVII. 581-2.

⁶ Reference from Dorè, *Recherches sur les Superstitions en Chine* (p. 446) in *The Encyclopaedia Sinica*, London, 1917, p. 95.

⁷ *New York Times Magazine*, May 24, 1931.

⁸ Richard Lydekker, *The Sheep and its Cousins*, London, 1912, p. 163.

of the family of Apollophanes, head of the Sidonian colony settled there, is shown a rhinoceros associated with an Indian elephant.⁹

Three kinds of rhinoceros are found in India today: (1) *Sumatrensis*, the smallest of them, occurs from Assam, where it is rare, to Borneo, being rather common in Tenasserim. It has two horns. (2) The *Javan* (*R. Sondaicus*) is found in Bengal and locally through Burma and Malaya. This variety, which is one-horned, is not so large as (3), the Great Indian Rhinoceros (*R. unicornis*), still found in Assam and in considerable numbers in the Nepalese Tarai.

Landon says¹⁰ that, although the rhinoceros prefers swamps and high grass, it is found along the Rapti in wooded jungles and up ravines and low hills in the Tarai. Many are shot each year, still there is no appreciable diminution in their numbers. Kirkpatrick, in 1793, reported that the forests on the southern slopes of Nepal were greatly infested with them.¹¹ Formerly they occurred along the base of the Himalayas to Peshawar. Babar, early in the sixteenth century (1519) hunted the rhinoceros in the north-west. His account is as follows:¹²

After sending on the army towards the river (Indus) I myself set off for Swāti, which they likewise call Karak-Khaneh (*Kark-Khāna*, "the rhinoceros haunt") to hunt the rhinoceros, but as the country abounds in brushwood we could not get at them. A she rhinoceros, that had whelps, came out, and fled along the plain. Many arrows were shot at her, but . . . she gained cover. We set fire to the brushwood, but the rhinoceros was not to be found. We got sight of another, that, having been scorched in the fire, was lamed and unable to run. We killed it, and everyone cut off a bit as a trophy of the chase.

A rhinoceros was sent from India to Portugal about 1553, and was later lost while being forwarded as a gift to the Pope.¹³

The "horn" is a mass of hairs cemented together by cells, and not a true horn.

The rhinoceros and the unicorn have claimed renewed attention through the publication of seals from Harappa and Mohenjo Daro,

⁹ *Palestine in General History*, Oxford, 1929, Plate 5.

¹⁰ Landon, *Nepal*, Vol. I, p. 292 (1928).

¹¹ *An Account of the Kingdom of Nepal* (in 1793), London, 1811.

¹² Taken from *Hobson-Jobson* (ed. of 1903), p. 762. Earlier accounts are quoted, 1387 and 1398.

¹³ *Hobson-Jobson*, pp. 363-4.

in 1924, and in the years immediately following. At both sites along the Indus many seals showing a unicorn with uplifted head over some object not clearly identified, have been found. In 1925, C. J. Gadd compared these with bulls on contemporary seals from Sumeria. The resemblance is striking. The object in front of the animal has been described as suggestive of a drum or of a sheaf of corn and as referring to some sort of cult. The thought of an altar where the beast was to be sacrificed has also been suggested. But, one of the pictures shown on Plate XLV of the *Archaeological Survey of India, Report* for 1925-26, leads me to suggest that the object may be some sort of a head-stall. Sir John Marshall thinks that all these seals depict bulls.¹⁴ But there is one figure, Plate XLV, number 7, in the *Report* for 1925-26, which shows the animal, with long neck and upraised head, *without* the horn in front of the ears, *but with one horn rising out of the snout*.¹⁵ Moreover, both on seals and in terra cotta of the same date, there are realistic pictures of the Great Indian Rhinoceros.¹⁶

The beast is clearly known in India from very early times and occupies a place of some sort in the cult even then.

If the position of the rhinoceros can not be fully established as sacred in the remote past, still there are fairly old references in India that do suggest it. In one of his Pillar Edicts, Asoka declared the rhinoceros to be a sacred animal.¹⁷ Of course the famous refrain from the *Sutta Nipāta*,¹⁸ "Let him wander alone like a rhinoceros", comes to mind. Manu (III, 271, 272) refers to the flesh of the rhinoceros as giving pleasure to the manes for twelve years, and states that its flesh is productive of satisfaction for endless time. Hopkins notes in his *Epic Mythology* (p. 33), among the families of the *pitrs* one of the *mūrtimantas* (embodied) as bearing the name *ekaśṛṅga* (unicorn). Is this an evidence of totemism? It is to be noted that it is by means of the *śrāddha* feast that the *pretas* are released and raised to the rank of *pitrs*. H. H. General Kaiser Sham Sher Jang Bahadur of Nepal says

¹⁴ *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, 1925-26, p. 86.

¹⁵ This figure is reproduced in *Antiquity*, Vol. II, Plate II, in the article on pages 83-5.

¹⁶ *Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Report*, 1925-26, Plate XLV, No. 19; 1924-25, Plate XXII, (c).

¹⁷ Radhakumud Mukerji, *Asoka*, London, 1928, p. 181; but he questions the rendering of the word *palasate*.

¹⁸ In the *Khaggavisāṇasutta*.

that the flesh and blood of the rhinoceros are considered pure and highly acceptable to the manes.¹⁹

Let us now consider present-day customs and traditions centering around the rhinoceros which suggest that it is a sacred animal.

Powdered rhinoceros hide is used by yogīs as a dusting for wounds. The rulers of Nepal and others who come to look at the rhinoceroses in the Zoological Gardens at Calcutta always worship them. In their adoration of the sun, yogīs wear a ring of rhinoceros horn on the second finger of the right hand; and in other forms of worship the same practice obtains. Some who do not wear the *cutiya* (scalp lock) use a ring of rhinoceros horn while making oblations of water. Earrings of rhinoceros horn are much prized by those yogīs whose distinctive mark is the huge rings worn in the cartillages of the ears.

Why is the animal sacred? One explanation that Śāivites give is that it bows its head slowly like an elephant, and so is sacred to Śiva, whose son has an elephant's head. In the *Mahābhārata*, *gaṇḍalin* is an epithet of Śiva.²⁰ In the *Kālikā Purāṇa*, Rudhirā-dhyaya chapter, it is stated that the flesh of the rhinoceros pleases the goddess for 500 years. And besides, Rāma Chandra possessed a shield of rhinoceros hide. Kānpaṭa yogīs, who, after initiation wear huge earrings of clay, say that the beast is associated with mud, the substance of their rings.

But the most interesting legends are associated with the *śrāddha* sacrifice and the traditions which have gathered about the Pāṇḍavas and the Kāuravas of The Great Epic. This is the same cycle of tradition to which belongs the family name *ekaśṛṅga*. The five Pāṇḍavas once killed a rhinoceros and used the hide as a vessel in which to offer water to the sun. An elaboration of this tradition will be given shortly.

¹⁹ Professor G. W. Brown has sent me the following quotation concerning the rhinoceros, from the *Hindī Shabdā Sāgara*, Vol. I, p. 840.

Is ke camre ki dhālen bantī hāiṅ

Is ke thūthan par ke sīng ke

Bhāratvarṣ meṅ arghā bantū hāi

Jo pitṛapan ke liye uttam mānā jātā hāi.

"From its hide shields are made; upon its snout there is a horn; in Hindusthan proper they make (from its hide) the oblation-vessel deemed best for offerings to the manes."

²⁰ 13. 1204. *Gaṇḍa* = rhinoceros.

The body and legs of the rhinoceros are offered to Gorakhnāth the master yogī, intimately related to the Gurkhas of Nepal. Landon (*Nepal*, Vol. I, p. 292), quoting from H. H. General Kaiser Sham Sher Jang Bahadur, says that its urine, as an anti-septic, is hung in a vessel at the principal door of the house as a charm against ghosts and evil spirits of disease. And further that, in connection with the sacrifice of the rhinoceros, most Gurkhas offer libations of blood to the manes after entering its disemboweled body. On ordinary *śrāddha* days libations of water and milk are made from a cup carved from its horn.

Finally, as illustrating both the offering of the funeral oblations and the pilgrimage of the Pāṇḍavas through the Himalayas, the following legend may be given, translated rather literally from the Hindi as it was given to the writer in one of the villages on the Ganges, above Hardwār, on the pilgrim road to Kedārnāth and Badrināth.

As the result of the great war between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kāuravas (the ancient war which is the central theme of the *Mahābhārata*) the Pāṇḍavas, by slaying their kinsmen in battle, were disqualified from performing the funeral rites for them. They appealed to Brahmā for absolution. In reply, the Creator commanded: "First make the pilgrimage to Badrināth and Kedārnāth". The Pāṇḍavas straightway set off upon the journey. Returning from the Himalayas, they reported to Brahmā and then asked for permission to perform the funeral rites for their slain kinsmen (ancestors). Brahmā then gave them the following instructions: "Kill a rhinoceros, make a vessel of its hide, and in that offer water to your relatives. They will receive the oblation and then will be able to proceed to Paradise." So the Pāṇḍavas slew a rhinoceros, made a vessel of its hide and, from it, poured out water as an oblation to their kinsmen. The *piṇḍa* was then offered (i. e., the funeral rites were then performed), and the slain relatives attained Paradise. Since that time the rhinoceros has been considered a sacred animal.

BRIEF NOTES

The Persian Wheel

The well-known device consisting of a series of vessels bound sidewise on a wheel, and so used to raise water from a shallow well as the wheel is made to revolve by means of a geared shaft worked by oxen, usually for irrigation purposes, is a familiar sight in northern India, and representations in Mughal paintings¹ are not uncommon. But the designation of this well-wheel as "Persian" is not justified if held to imply a Persian origin in historic times. In any case, the well-wheel has a long history in India.

The Sanskrit term is *araghaṭṭa* (-ka) occurring, e. g., in the Pañcatantra (though only in a late and historically unimportant version) and the Rājatarāṅginī; corresponding are Pali *arahatta* (for *araghaṭṭa*?), Prakrit *araghaṭṭa*, Hindī *arhaṭ*, *rahaṭ*. There are also Sanskrit *ghaṭi-yantra* and Pali *ghaṭi-yanta* and *cakka-vaṭṭaka*.

In Cull. V, 16, 2 (Vin. II, 122), where three kinds of water-raising devices are permitted for monastery wells, the well-wheel is designated *cakkavattaka*, glossed by Buddhaghosa (quoted Vin. II, 318) as *arhatta-ghaṭi-yanta*. The two other permitted devices, both still in common use, are the *tulā* or well-sweep, glossed as the "water-lifting device used by gardeners", and the *karakaṭaka*, "an apparatus worked by bulls or elephants with a long rope" by which a leathern bucket (*cammakhaṇḍa*) is pulled up and let down as the animals move away from or towards the well.

Numerous later references aptly illustrate the character of the well-wheel. In the Divyāvadāna, 300, a five-spoked "Wheel of Life" is depicted (*likhitam*) in a gate-house (*dvāra-koṣṭaka*) with a *bhikṣu* appointed to explain it to the householders as they passed to and fro; the wheel represents the *saṃsāra*, which is likened to the operation of a *ghaṭi-yantra*. In the Harṣacarita, 104 (Ch. 3), Nirṇaya Sāgara ed., 1925, p. 94, we read, *samanta-uddhāta-ghaṭi-sicyamāna-jiraka-jūṭair jaṭilīta-bhūmih*, "land irrigated by the close-set, outpouring, upward-moving jars, as they are actively (or, abundantly sprinkling) made to move"; the Commentary has *araghaṭṭa*. *Ib.* 113, text, p. 104, *udanaś ca ghaṭi-yantra-mālām iva*

¹ E. g., H. Goetz, *Bilderatlas zur Kulturgeschichte Indiens in der Grossmogul-Zeit*, Fig. 106.

rudrākṣamālā compares a rosary to a well-wheel garland, the pots round the rim being thought of as like beads on a chain; but *ib.* 286 (Ch. 8), text p. 254, *ghaṭana-ghaṭi-rāji-rajjavaḥ*, "long ropes connected to a *ghaṭi*", the reference seems to be to the bucket well worked by bulls, rather than to the well-wheel, which is not in fact operated by ropes.

In a verse cited by Kṣemandra from Amaraka, quoted in *JRAS* 1916, p. 168, there is a simile of the water that rushes out of a bucket as it turns. In the *Prabandhacintāmaṇi*, translation, p. 35 (text not available), we have "Do you not see that in the water-wheel for irrigating fields, the empty buckets become full, and the full buckets empty?". In Jacobi, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshtrī*, 18/19, there is a story about an *āraghaṭṭika*, a man who works a Persian wheel.

Finally, on the north side of a Jain temple of the twelfth century at Maṇḍor in Rājputana, there is a relief representing a Persian wheel very clearly; this is published in *ASI, AR*, 1909-10, Pl. XLIV.

Upavīṇa

In my discussion of the *Parts of a vīṇā* (*JAOS.* 50. 244-253, see especially p. 252) the meaning of this term was not clearly ascertained. Mr. P. V. Bapat now points out to me that in the *Visuddhimagga*, Ch. 20 (PTS ed., p. 630¹) the sound is said to be produced because of the *vīṇā*, *upavīṇa*, and a man's suitable effort. Dhammapāla in his Commentary explains *upavīṇa* as *vīṇā-vādāna*. Gaṇṭhi, a later commentator, explains it as something made of ivory or horn, requisite to the *upadhamsana* of the *vīṇā*; *upadhamsana* has meanings such as "urging, inciting, producing," and must here refer to the production of sound by striking. It would therefore seem very evident that *upavīṇa*, literally "*vīṇā*-accessory" must = "plectrum." However, if this be so, it is not clear why *upavīṇa* and *koṇa* should be mentioned together in the *Miln.* 53, and *SN.* IV. 197 lists. In the latter, the Comm. has *upaveṇa* = *upadharāṇa* = *veṭhaka*, which should mean some kind of wrapping; cf. *patta*. It is stated that the sound is produced by

¹ The rendering "vellum" in the PTS translation, p. 766, is certainly mistaken.

the *koṇa*, i. e. the plectrum, combined with the proper effort of the player (*koṇa* is glossed *caturam̐sa-sāra-daṇḍaka*, “a four-cornered piece of *sāra*-wood”); this compared with the Visuddhimagga passage again suggests that *upaviṇa* = *koṇa*. Against this is the list of parts, mentioning both. In any case *upaviṇa* is not “bridge” as the PTS translation has it.

The following are additional references to parts of a *viṇā*: Visuddhimagga, 251, *viṇādoṇikonaddhacamma*, “skin stretched over the belly of the *viṇā*”; *ib.*, 354, the *mahāviṇā* is covered with wet ox-hide; *ib.*, 594, *doṇi*, *tanti*.

ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY.

Museum of Fine Arts,
Boston.

Sanskrit *te* for *tvām*

In my article on “Hindu Salutations” in the *Rapson Studies*, p. 380, I suggested that the epic *icchāmi tvām ahaṃ jñātum* and *jñātum icchāmi te* were significant, though, since *jñā* may take either accusative or genitive, the parallelism is not sufficient to establish *te* as accusative, an idea originally espoused by Pischel. But R. 7. 49. 10, *apāpāṃ vedmi Site te* (cf. *trātāraṃ Rāma vidmas tvām*, G. 7. 66. 23) shows that *te* must here be accusative, standing for *tvām*, which is actually found in the corresponding passage, G. 51. 19, *apāpāṃ vedmi Site tvām*. Again, in R. 7. 71. 12, *upāghrāṣyāmi te mūrdhni*, compared with G. 77. 12, *mūrdhni tvām* (cf. the following *mūrdhni Śatrughnam upāghrāya*), points to another instance of *te* as *tvām*, for the invariable construction with *upāghrā* as “kiss” is accusative of the person and locative of the part kissed. Since *te* for *tvām* occurs in Ardhamāgadhī and Śāurasenī (Pischel, *Gr. Prāk. Sprachen*, § 421), there can be no doubt that the dialectic *te* form has crept into later versions of the epic. Whether *jānan me* (H. 7095) has been attracted into the same form (Pischel, § 415) or is genitive, may be questioned, and the same doubt as to accusative *te* arises in regard to some of the epic passages, where *śape te* means “I entreat thee” and stands parallel to *tvām śape* in that sense, in distinction from the usual meaning “swear to thee” (dative).

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

Yale University.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Yakṣas. By ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY. Part I, Washington: SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, 1928; Part II, 1931. Part I: 43 pp. and 23 plates; Part II: 84 pp. and 50 plates.

Dr. Coomaraswamy's treatise on Yakṣas, which was motivated as a study in early Indian iconography, even in Part I passed beyond that limit into the larger field of Yakṣa and Yakṣī worship, and in Part II goes into the subject of the water cosmology in early Indian religion and its iconographic reflections. The material presented shows that this method of treatment is correct; for all the themes discussed are closely connected.

His thesis is, in brief, that the iconography of India rises from vegetation, wealth, and fertility cults that may well enough be considered Indo-Aryan but certainly not of proethnic Indo-European antiquity. To give the idea phraseology slightly different from that used by the author, this means that the significant phase of Indian religions is an animism which is non-Aryan in origin. Some phases of these "Indo-Aryan" cults appear also to be Iranian, having been adopted by the Aryans from cultures flourishing in pre-Aryan times in Mesopotamia and Iran; others so far have been found only in India. On the question of Mesopotamian sources Dr. Coomaraswamy wisely remains fairly non-committal, and his remarks are only secondary and suggestive. On the matter of non-Aryan sources in India he is more definite, although there again the material is elusive. Comparatively little of popular worship at the time of the Mauryans, when sculpture turns seriously to the use of stone as a medium, is found described in the great body of Vedic literature, especially in the Four Vedas; the items that appear are likely to be late or secondary. The course of religious history is an association of the Vedic Aryan deities with the non-Aryan cults, with a consequent change in character of those deities and an alteration of their proportional importance. The scope of the non-Aryan cults is better indicated in the post-Vedic literature and still better in the iconography.

The Yakṣas are "guardians of the vegetative source of life . . . and thus closely connected with the waters." They also control wealth and grant fertility, and are tutelary divinities. The Yakṣa shrine gives the type for the sectarian temples; early *pūjā* is Yakṣa

worship and had a *bhakti* aspect, although there is no reason to consider that *bhakti* was well developed before the time of the Bhagavad Gītā. Because the Yakṣas are connected with the waters, they are represented from Mauryan times onward in connection with water symbols, although the latter may appear without Yakṣa accompaniment in the formulae of lotus rhizome, often springing from the mouth or navel of a Yakṣa, or from a full jar, or from the open jaws of a *makura* or a fish-tailed elephant. The word Yakṣa appears in the Veda in a variety of uses, being sometimes malevolent as indicating the deity of a rival non-Aryan folk, and sometimes benevolent as indicating a great being or a deity. In due time the Yakṣa cults are legitimized in the Aryan environment, and Kubera, Māṇibhadra, the Lokapālas, Śrī, Gaṇeṣa, and others assume a general Indian importance.

In discussing the water cosmology Dr. Coomaraswamy finds two sources, namely, the Vedas and the Plant Style in the decorative art of the earliest monuments. He presents a large number of passages from the Vedas, and states that "Indian art is to a greater extent than has been supposed an illustration of Vedic ideas." This statement I believe true provided by "Vedic" we mean late Rig-Vedic and what succeeds. Might it not be better to transpose the parts of his proposition and say that to a larger extent than has been supposed pre-Aryan notions have attached themselves even in the Four Vedas to the figures of Varuṇa, Agni, Prajāpati?

The general thesis of Dr. Coomaraswamy's discussion seems well established, and the explanation of figures and motifs has greatly increased our knowledge. On some minor points additional material may be offered or reservations made.¹ Some of the RV material used in discussing the water cosmology I should be inclined to associate with the Agni-Sūrya-Viṣṇu complex rather than with Varuṇa (cf. *JAOS* 51. 108 ff.), and I should see in Sun-worship another important phase of pre-Aryan religion. The remarks on *dohada* might have included a reference to Bloomfield's paper (*JAOS* 40. 1-24) and those on the fulfilment of wishes in another existence might have mentioned Edgerton's paper (*Annals of the Bhandarkar Institute*, Vol. VIII, Part III, pp. 219-49). In speaking of the power of Yakṣas to change their forms, he might

¹ In this connection it should be noted that Part I is not now to be read without taking into account the twelve pages of Addenda appearing at the beginning of Part II.

have added that they can effect change of sex and can grant that power to others (*JAOS* 47. 5, 14-16). The world tree is perhaps sometimes associated by the RV priests, in magnifying the sacrificial ritual, with the sacrificial post (RV 1. 164. 20; 10. 81. 4; 10. 31. 7). The fact, as brought out by Dr. Coomaraswamy, that the Gandharvas, Varuṇa, and Kāma are associated with the *makara* suggests the guess that Gandharva and Kandarpa (= Kāma) may be only dialectic variations of the same word.

The entire study is most informing and gives a solid basis for the understanding of early Indian iconography, while it also adds much to our comprehension of pre-Aryan animism.

A Comparative and Etymological Dictionary of the Nepali Language. By RALPH LILLEY TURNER. With indexes of all words quoted from other Indo-Aryan languages, compiled by DOROTHY RIVERS TURNER. London: KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRUBNER AND Co., LTD., 1931. Pp. xxiv + 935.

This large dictionary is of high importance in Indic studies, and immediately on its publication has become a standard work of reference. The number of scholars working intensively in Nepali is very small, but the use of Professor Turner's volume will by no means be confined to them. All students of the comparative lexical and etymological aspects of any of the modern Indo-Aryan languages will use it, for it constitutes the last word to date in that field. To a less and varying degree it is valuable also to students of Indic languages of ancient and mediaeval times.

As a dictionary of Nepali this pioneer work is beyond my capacity to judge. The author modestly speaks of it as only "a beginning of a better and completer work in other hands more competent." How much material remains to be added only a scholar proficient in Nepali could presume to estimate. Probably there is some. Having occasion recently to look for the derivation of the word *barwāl* (*barūāl*, according to Hodgson, *JASB* 16. 1010), said to be Nepalese, meaning a certain breed of sheep used especially for fighting, I failed to find a correspondent for it in Professor Turner's work. Possibly a handful of additional words could be gleaned from articles dealing with the flora and fauna of Nepal, as published in the *JASB* and elsewhere, and other words may appear in current

speech and writing. In due time Professor Turner will doubtless issue a supplement to the present splendid volume.

In its comparative and etymological features the work calls for high praise. In the modern field the researches of Beames, Hoernle, Grierson, Bloch, Morgenstierne, Chatterji, Lorimer, Bailey, and many more, and all the standard dictionaries have been painstakingly exploited; little, if anything, of other scholars' work has been ignored. In the ancient field the standard works have been employed, but naturally the field as a whole has been exploited in less exhaustive fashion. The derivations and comparisons, as far as I have examined them, are careful, and there are copious bibliographical references. Where the suggestions are doubtful, Professor Turner has disarmed criticism by stating so, for his presentation is not dogmatic. One of the most valuable features of the work is the array of indexes to words quoted from other Indo-Aryan tongues. There is also a brief, but informing, introduction.

The page arrangement, which is much like that of Grierson's *Dictionary of the Kashmīrī Language*, is excellent, and the facility of using the work is thereby much increased, as it is also by the good typography and press work.

Tukaram. Translation from Mahipati's Bhaktalīlāmṛta. By JUSTIN E. ABBOTT. (The Poet-Saints of Maharashtra, No. 7). Summit (N. J.): JUSTIN E. ABBOTT, 1930. \$1.25. Pp. xx + 346.

In this latest volume of the Poet-Saints of Maharashtra Dr. Abbott gives a translation of Mahipati's life of Tukaram as related in his Bhaktalīlāmṛta (written 1774). There is another life of Tuka by Mahipati in his Bhaktavijaya (1762), which Dr. Abbott mentions in his introduction as differing in some respects from that presented here.

The usual dates for Tukaram, as accepted by Dr. Abbott, are 1608-49, and by the time of Mahipati legend had already clustered in profusion about the name of the celebrated Śudra devoté. Some of the stories Mahipati tells about Tuka I myself heard orally in 1928 among the people of Dehu, Tuka's home, and Alandi, a nearby town also of sanctity; and this fact suggests that part of the unknown sources of Mahipati, to which Dr. Abbott refers, is likely to

be popular tradition rather than literary works. Some of the miracles show a similarity to Christian legends (the feeding of the multitude, the inexhaustible vessel of oil, the translation of Tuka to heaven), but the likeness is probably illusory. Legend makes Sivaji (1627-80) pay Tuka two visits, but since Sivaji was only twenty-two when Tuka died, the legend is likely to be baseless.

The value of the Maratha devotional authors and of Dr. Abbott's work in making them accessible has been mentioned in notices of earlier volumes in the same series (*JAOS* 47. 280; 50. 76; 50. 271). The continuous growth of the series is of importance to Indology.

W. NORMAN BROWN.

University of Pennsylvania.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

Rev. Dr. George Foot Moore, professor emeritus of the history of religion in Harvard University, died on May 16 in his eightieth year. He was Recording Secretary of the Society from 1895 to 1911, Editor of the *JOURNAL* from 1896 to 1900, and President from 1911 to 1913. The funeral services were attended by Professors Lanman, Lyon, and Ropes as representatives of the Society by appointment of the President.

Professor Heinrich Lüders, of the University of Berlin, honorary member of this SOCIETY, has been elected Rector of the University of Berlin.

The Executive Committee has elected the following persons as corporate members:

Mr. Julean Arnold
Miss Dorothy Blair
Mr. George G. Cameron
Miss Lillian C. Canfield
Miss Ethel Elkins
Dr. Frank H. Foster
Miss Nejla M. Izzeddin
Rabbi Phinehas P. Kartzinel
Dr. Abram S. Kotsuji
Prof. Cecilio Lopez

Miss Florence Lowden
Miss Julie Michelet
Sir Bhupendra Nath Mitra
Mr. John Nicolson
Dr. Freeland F. Penney
Rev. Claude L. Pickens, Jr.
Prof. Arno Poebel
Dr. Otto B. Rupp
Miss Winifred Smeaton
Mr. Grant Williams

HSÜAN CHUANG AND THE WEI SHIH PHILOSOPHY

CLARENCE H. HAMILTON

OBERLIN COLLEGE

THE PRESENT study is collateral to a detailed examination of one of Hsüan Chuang's philosophical translations. It is an attempt to assemble and put into strong relief the essential facts concerning the basic intellectual interest of the famous pilgrim in his journey to India in search of authentic Buddhist wisdom. Tradition has long repeated that Hsüan Chuang was the founder of the Fa-hsiang Tsung (法相宗), the Dharmalakṣaṇa school of thought in China, and the great teacher and translator of its books, which set forth a radically idealistic world view. The statement is generally made in connection with brief expositions of the different Buddhist sects, such as that by Nanjio,¹ well known since 1886, or that by Yang Wen-hui (楊文會) which forms the basis for Heinrich Hackmann's study of "Die Schulen des Chinesischen Buddhismus,"² in 1911. But interest in the matter usually stops at that point. The school in question is represented as having long since died out and its literature has, for the most part, remained buried and unexamined in the great mass of translations in the Chinese Buddhist Tripiṭaka.

Within the last decade, however, Mahāyānist studies have showed a marked turning of attention in the direction of this very branch of philosophy which was the special concern of Hsüan Chuang.

(1). In 1922 Sylvain Lévi discovered in Nepal the original Sanskrit texts of two basic treatises by Vasubandhu, the greatest expositor of the idealistic school in Indian Buddhism. The treatises are the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, *Viṃśatikā* and *Trimśikā*,³ known in the Chinese canon as *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun* (唯識二十論)⁴ and *Wei-shih-san-shih-lun* (唯識三十論)⁵ respec-


¹ Bunyiu Nanjio, *A Short History of the Twelve Japanese Buddhist Sects*, pp. 34-5.

² *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen zu Berlin*, vol. 14, 1911, pp. 246-8.

³ *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi: Deux Traités de Vasubandhu; Viṃśatikā et Trimśikā*. Publiés par Sylvain Lévi: Paris, Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, 1925.

⁴ Nanjio, *Catalogue of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka*, nos. 1238, 1239, 1240.

⁵ *Ibid.*, no. 1215.



tively. These constitute, in the words of M. Lévi, "l'exposé classique du système Vijñānamātra ou Vijñaptimātra, 'pure idéation', ou 'pure idéification', le système le plus florissant encore aujourd'hui dans les écoles bouddhistes du Tibet, de la Chine et du Japon". Putting it a little less technically we may say that this system has as its central contention the idealistic doctrine that the universe is mental representation only. It marks, probably, the highest point of metaphysical reflection attained by intellectual Buddhism. The philosophy was elaborated by Vasubandhu and his elder brother Asaṅga during the first half of the fourth century A. D. Translations of its scriptures into Chinese were made chiefly in the sixth and seventh centuries. Of the two particular texts in question the Sanskrit has been long since lost to the Far East. Chinese and Japanese have studied their ideas only through the versions of Prajñāruci, Paramārtha, and Hsüan Chuang. Consequently their scholars have hailed with delight the publication of the Sanskrit originals by M. Lévi in 1925. This is one important event.

(2). A second important consideration for students of Far Eastern thought is the fact that the *Chih-na-nei-hsüeh-yüan* (支那內學院) or Chinese Academy of Buddhist Learning at Nanking is publishing a series of Selected Works From The Chinese Tripiṭaka, critically edited by collating the various Chinese versions with their Sanskrit, Pali, or Tibetan counterparts. The first series, consisting of twenty-five works in twenty-eight volumes, in all about 4000 pages, was first advertised in 1930. This is the work of Ou-yang Ching-wu (歐陽竟無) and his collaborators. Ou-yang is the foremost disciple of Yang Wen-hui (楊文會), who was the leading Chinese Buddhist scholar of the last generation and founder in 1870 of the Buddhist Publishing House at Nanking, the Nan-ching K'e-ching-ch'u (南京刻經處). Mr. Ou-yang is himself an adherent and expounder of the Vijñaptimātra or Wei Shih (唯識) Philosophy and has included in his first series of edited texts all the important scriptures of that doctrine. In editing the great *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論) which is a translation of Vasubandhu's Treatise of Thirty Gāthās" (the Trisīkā) with ten combined commentaries, he has made use of M. Lévi's new Sanskrit text. In his publications Hsüan Chuang's translations are taken as basic and the alternate readings of other translations are given on the margins of the pages.

(3). In Europe attention to the Wei Shih Philosophy is signalized by Professor La Vallée Poussin's French translation of Hsüan Chuang's version of the above-mentioned *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun*.⁶ To the other commentaries Professor La Vallée Poussin adds the material of K'uei Chi's (窺基) commentary.⁷ The whole work is a mine of information on the details of the philosophical doctrine and its distinctions from the other schools of thought in the India of Vasubandhu's day as analyzed by the commentators.

(4). A fourth significant work has just appeared in Japan. Mr. D. T. Suzuki in 1930 published his *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*,⁸ in which he finds a doctrine of mind-only (*cittamātra*) closely paralleling the Wei Shih doctrine of representation only (*viññaptimātra*). This raises interesting questions as to earlier and later stages of the Wei Shih philosophy. Did Asaṅga and Vasubandhu find the germ of their ideas in intuitions arising first in crude form in earlier sūtras, intuitions which they later developed into elaborate rational statement? Can the process be traced?

But investigation into the details of this philosophy belongs primarily to the field of Indian Buddhism and constitutes a task which calls for collaboration of both Indologists and Sinologists. For Sinologists interest turns more naturally upon the question of the circumstances which drew the mind of Hsüan Chuang into the net of the ideas of the Wei Shih Philosophy. So far as the present writer's knowledge goes, Hsüan Chuang's personal relationship to Wei Shih has not been treated as a single topic. It has been taken for granted rather than studied, although materials lie scattered through the pages both of Hsüan's biography by Hui Li and of his own Memoirs, while examination of his translations and their prefaces will doubtless reveal yet more. This lack of attention may be due in part to the fact that the significance of the Wei Shih Philosophy has not been appreciated by those primarily interested in the pilgrim's geographical information; and in part to the feeling that since the general fact of his intellectual preference is known, examination of details simply confirms the obvious.

⁶ Louis De La Vallée Poussin, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi; La Siddhi de Hsüan-Tsang*, traduite et annotée: Paris, Librairie Orientaliste, Paul Geuthner, 1929.

⁷ K'uei Chi was Hsüan Chuang's chief disciple and after him the most ardent expounder of the Wei Shih Philosophy.

⁸ D. T. Suzuki, *Studies in the Lankavatara Sutra*: London, Routledge, 1930.

We find, for example, that Thomas Watters, while recognizing that "Yüan-chwang in his travels cared little for other things and wanted to know only Buddha and Buddhism", is content to dismiss that knowledge of Buddhism as an interest in "Yoga and powerful magical formulae used with solemn invocations . . . Prajñāpāramitā and the abstract subtleties of a vague and fruitless philosophy . . . dreamlands of delight beyond the tomb . . . P'usas like Kwan-shi-yin who supplant the Buddhas, etc."⁹ T. W. Rhys Davids is much more discerning when he remarks in the preface to Watters's book, "At the time when Yüan-chwang travelled in India, not only all the most famous Buddhist teachers but all the teachers of the school of thought especially favoured by the famous pilgrim, the school of Vasubandhu, wrote in Sanskrit."¹⁰ But neither Rhys Davids nor those pioneer translators of pilgrim lore, Julien and Beal, were in a position to understand Hsüan Chuang's interest as we are today.

The increase of materials for our own study of Mahāyānist idealism reawakens our interest in the particulars of Hsüan Chuang's devotion to this school of thought. There are several questions which serve to give definition to the problem as we approach it. How early did Hsüan Chuang come into contact with the teachings? Who were his teachers and what were the books? Whose translations did he use before going to India, and what caused his dissatisfaction with them? Since Hsüan Chuang's translations of these writings have become standard, what improvement is observable over earlier translations? How true is Hsüan Chuang to his Sanskrit texts? Are there any constant deviations detectable which indicate some interpretation and change of the material in passing through Hsüan Chuang's mind? If there are, do these deviations indicate a conscious or unconscious adjustment of the Indian ideas to the Chinese mind? An exhaustive answer to all these questions is obviously too large an order for a single paper but the present study may possibly indicate that something may be done as a beginning with all of them.

As primary sources the writer has utilized the following :

⁹ Thomas Watters, *On Yüan Chwang*, vol. I, p. 15.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, preface, p. vi.

a. For biographical material:

1. *Ta-t'zu-en-ssu-san-tsang-fa-shih-ch'üan*,¹¹ the well-known Life of Hsüan Chuang by his disciple Hui Li,¹² with annotations by Yen Ts'ung.¹³ (For reference the paging in Beal's translation *Life of Hiuen-Tsang* is used.)

b. For literary material:

2. *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, *Vimśatikā*, by Vasubandhu in Sanskrit.
3. Three Chinese translations of the foregoing:
 - a. By Prajñāruci, some time between 508-535 A. D.¹⁴
 - b. By Paramārtha, some time between 557-569 A. D.¹⁵
 - c. By Hsüan Chuang in 661 A. D.¹⁶

In the edition of the Nanking K'ê-ching-ch'ü these three translations are bound together in one volume entitled *Wei-shih-er-shih-lun-hui-i* (唯識二十論會譯) or "Assembled Translations of the Treatise of Twenty Gāthās on Representation Only." This is the edition used, though in the case of Hsüan Chuang's translation, it has been carefully compared with the Tokio edition of 1884 at the Library of Congress, but without finding important differences.

For the purpose of our study the life of Hsüan Chuang may be divided into three periods; the first being that of his early years to the time of his departure for India; the second being the period abroad; the third including his activities after his return.

(1). It is to be observed that from the beginning of his Buddhist studies as a youth Hsüan Chuang was exposed to teachings of the Wei Shih School. One of his first opportunities after admission to the Ching T'u (淨土) monastery at Loyang, when he was about thirteen years of age, was to study with a certain Yen Fa-shih (嚴法師) Asaṅga's "Comprehensive Treatise of Mahāyāna

¹¹ 大慈恩寺三藏法師傳, Nanjio, no. 1494.

¹² 慧立.

¹³ 彥棕.

¹⁴ 大乘楞伽經唯識論. Mistakenly assigned to Bodhiruci in Nanjio, no. 1238.

¹⁵ 大乘唯識論, Nanjio, no. 1239.

¹⁶ 唯識二十論, Nanjio, no. 1240.

Buddhism," the *She-ta-sheng-lun* (攝大乘論) or Mahāyāna-saṃparigrahaśāstra.¹⁷ Whether it was in the translation of Buddhaśānta¹⁸ of A. D. 531 or that by Paramārtha¹⁹ of A. D. 563 we do not know, but it could not have escaped him that this treatise sets down as a distinguishing mark of Mahāyāna the conception of ultimate reality as the *ālayavijñāna*, the receptacle consciousness which contains the seeds of all existence.²⁰ Later he heard this same *śāstra* expounded by Sai Hsien (塞暹), one of the most renowned priests of the empire summoned to lecture at Loyang by the emperor himself.²¹ Later still at Ch'ang-An he associated with two masters, Ch'ang (常) and Pien (辯) who preferred to discuss this treatise above all sūtras.²² By that time he had completed his twentieth year, was already fully ordained, and had himself lectured on the treatise during a period of retirement at Hangchow.²³

There can be no doubt that Asaṅga's ideas were in vogue. Nevertheless Hsüan Chuang did not limit his attention either to these or to Mahāyānist treatises generally. Some time in his early twenties he tried his intellectual strength on Harivarman's Satya-siddhiśāstra (成實論)²⁴ and Vasubandhu's Abhidharmakośaśāstra (俱舍論)²⁵. Both of these classify, according to Nanjio's catalog, among the Treatises of the Hīnayāna (小乘論). Yet both of these have been recognized as having transitional value in the direction of idealistic notions.²⁶ In the passage relating to Hsüan Chuang's study of the treatises Beal writes down the surprising statement that "after one reading he was perfected, and he retained the whole treatise in memory". To anyone acquainted with the immense bulk of the Abhidharmakośa (it fills twenty-two fascicules in Paramārtha's translation, the one probably used by Hsüan Chuang) such a feat is unbelievable. Yet Hui Li's text, in the

¹⁷ S. Beal, *Life of Hiuen-Tsang*, p. 4, translates it as "Mahāyāna Sāstra".

¹⁸ Nanjio, no. 1184.

¹⁹ Nanjio, no. 1183.

²⁰ See D. T. Suzuki in *The Eastern Buddhist*, vol. II, pp. 107-8.

²¹ Beal, *Life*, pp. 5, 6.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 9, 雖合綜衆經而偏講攝大乘論.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

²⁴ Nanjio, no. 1274.

²⁵ Nanjio, no. 1269.

²⁶ Otto Rosenberg, *Die Probleme der Buddhistischen Philosophie*, pp. 37, 274.

²⁷ Beal, *Life*, p. 9.

Ming edition at least, is almost as extravagant. "Of both of these (treatises)", he says, "he exhausted the purport in one reading: glancing over he retained in memory".²⁸ The young scholar's capacity for assimilating scholastic argument must have been remarkable. Especially significant is his insight into Vasubandhu's reasonings. For although the Abhidharmakośa was written by Vasubandhu while he was still a metaphysical realist of the Sarvāstivādin Hīnayāna its arguments form a background which he did not lose sight of in establishing the idealism of the Vijñaptimātra later. One who has understood the Abhidharmakośa is well prepared to appreciate the dialectics of the Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi.

So far the evidence is unmistakeable that Wei Shih ideas were ably represented in Hsüan Chuang's early intellectual environment. But did he give his personal preference to this system before leaving China? Hui Li writes that, on attempting to verify the doctrines of his various Masters, "He saw that the holy books differed much, so that he knew not which to follow. He then resolved to travel to the Western world in order to ask about doubtful passages".²⁹ On the face of it this statement seems to imply that Hsüan Chuang was reacting simply to the uncorrelated variety of the Buddhist teaching generally afloat in his time. But there follows a sentence of great importance, "He also took the treatise called *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun* (十七地論) to explain his various doubts: this treatise is now called *Yü-chia-shih-ti-lun*" (瑜伽師地論). Now the *Yü-chia-shih-ti-lun* is Hsüan Chuang's own translation, thirty-seven years later in A. D. 646-7, of what Nanjio calls the "principal work of the Yogācārya School founded by Asaṅga".³⁰ He restores its Sanskrit title as the Yogācāryabhūmiśāstra, which may be translated as "Treatise on the Stages of a Yogi", i. e. of one practiced in meditation. It is a religious work mapping out seventeen stages in the attainment of Buddhistic enlightenment; and it involves the idealistic conceptions of the Wei Shih Philosophy, which are part of the means to the religious realization. Ancient tradition says it was dictated to Asaṅga by Maitreya, the Buddha to come. This was the book which the young priest had evidently

²⁸ 皆一遍而盡其旨經目而記於心。

²⁹ Beal, *Life*, p. 10.

³⁰ Nanjio, no. 1170.

chosen for his guide in the long pathway of Buddhistic ascent on which his feet were set. The fact explains much, as we shall see presently.

But whose translation was this *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun* which gave trouble to Hsüan Chuang and about which he had doubts? Can something be learned of its imperfections? Nanjio's catalog, which lists only extant translations, does not contain this. It is necessary to go back to the T'ang Dynasty *K'ai-yüan-shih-chiao-lu* (開元釋教錄) which lists also titles of translations lost before A. D. 730, the time when this catalog was compiled.³¹ We there find that the *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun* or "Seventeen Stages Treatise (*Saptadaśabhūmiśāstra*)" was translated by the Indian priest Paramārtha (波羅末陀) in A. D. 550,³² or seventy-nine years before the pilgrim set forth on his famous journey. We also find from the accompanying biographical notice that the circumstances connected with the translation were unfortunate. Paramārtha arrived in China in the troubled days of Liang Wu-ti (梁武帝), A. D. 502-556, bringing a great number of texts for translation. But "desirous as was that sovereign to encourage the translation of sacred texts and the creation of a new literature in imitation of the flourishing epochs of Ts'in (秦) and of Ts'i (齊), he could not succeed in the undertaking because of the continual revolts which were agitating the empire. The Indian preacher wandered with his treasure in the Eastern provinces until, in going towards the South, he arrived at the district of Fu-ch'un (富春), in Hang-chou-fu (杭州府) where the governor of the district, Lu Yüan-chê (陸元哲), organized for him a staff of more than twenty learned priests, Pao Ch'iung (寶瓊) and others, to assist him in his translating. He commenced the translation of the *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun* (十七地論) but he had scarcely finished five chapters (卷) of it when he was obliged to interrupt his work because of political turmoils which continued to rage in the empire".³³ This happened in

³¹ Nanjio, no. 1485. The catalog was compiled in the K'ai Yüan Period of the T'ang Dynasty by the monk Chih Sheng (智昇). See 大藏經, 目錄部, 開元釋教錄, 卷第六, p. 四十七.

³² Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, vol. I, p. 423.

³³ See 大藏經, *op. cit.* I follow here the somewhat condensed translation of this passage by M. J. Takakusu in *Bulletin de L'École Française*

A. D. 550. Apparently the work was never finished. The *K'ai-yüan-lu* makes no further reference to it, but recounts that when Paramārtha returned to his translating after the political turmoil it was an entirely different scripture which he took up, the *Chin-kuang-ming-ching* (金光明經) or *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra*.³⁴

This *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun* of Paramārtha must have been the text in circulation in China when Hsüan Chuang was a youth. The *K'ai-yüan-lu* knows no other translation of the work prior to Hsüan Chuang's own. From the same source we learn that Paramārtha was the translator of other texts of the Wei Shih School, that he personally professed the idealism of Asaṅga's *Mahāyāna-saṃparigrahaśāstra* (攝大乘論) and was responsible in large part for the diffusion of that system in China.³⁵ This puts in a qualified light the common statement that Hsüan Chuang was the founder of the Fa-hsiang Tsung (法相宗) in China. Hsüan Chuang was certainly not the introducer of the ideas into China nor the first convinced expounder of them. If he is regarded as the founder of a *tsung* (sometimes translated as "sect") it must be in the sense of having directed a large number of disciples into earnest and specialized study of the literature so that they became a self-conscious group. With regard to the *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun*, however, we can readily understand how the incompleteness of the truncated text of Paramārtha could intrigue the aspiring young scholar to begin his work of clearing up difficulties with that treatise in particular.

But there must have been other causes of dissatisfaction apart from its unfinished state as a religious guide. Being the first translation undertaken by Paramārtha after his arrival in China, it doubtless contained all the infelicities of a first attempt at transferring ideas into a language not one's own, even with a staff of twenty assistants. Even in his later, more accomplished, translations Paramārtha's style is not free from difficulties. An examination of his translation of Vasubandhu's *Vimśatikā*, for example, as compared with that of Hsüan Chuang has revealed the following types of inferiority, a few examples of which we give:

d'Extrême-Orient, tome IV, pp. 60-61. Mr. Takakusu's translation of Paramārtha's *Life* is based upon both the *K'ai-yüan-lu* and the *Chen-yüan-lu* (貞元新定釋教目錄; also in 大藏經, 目錄部).

³⁴ Also lost before 730 A. D.

³⁵ Takakusu, *op. cit.* BEFEO IV. 64.

1. The use of longer, more wordy phrases and expressions, e. g.

Sanskrit	Paramārtha	Hsüan Chuang
<i>trāidhātukam</i>	三界者	三界
<i>anartha</i>	實無外塵	無實境
<i>kim atra kāraṇam</i>	何因作如此執	此有何因
<i>buddhānām viśaya</i>	佛境界	佛境
<i>abhilāpya</i>	不可言	離言

2. Less precision in selecting Chinese equivalents of Sanskrit terms. Compare, e. g., the literal meanings of the following:

Sanskrit	Paramārtha	Hsüan Chuang
<i>viśaya</i> : region or sphere (of sense activity).	塵 <i>ch'en</i> : dust, the world (the sense world).	境 <i>ching</i> : region, district (of sense activity).
<i>paramāṇu</i> : i. e. <i>para-ma-āṇu</i> extreme minute (i. e. the atom).	鄰虛 <i>lin hsü</i> : near empty, i. e. next to nothing (hence, atom).	極微 <i>chi wei</i> : the utmost minute (hence, atom).
<i>saṃtāna</i> : continued succession.	人 <i>jen</i> : man, person.	相續 <i>hsiang hsü</i> : mutual continuation.

Saṃtāna is a technical term meaning the stream of events which constitute the individual person.

It will be observed that in every case Hsüan Chuang has chosen a term whose literal significance accords more closely with the Sanskrit.

3. A certain heaviness and awkwardness of sentence structure, difficult to indicate by isolated passages but something of which one becomes aware in the process of reading the two translations together.

Paramārtha was not alone in his difficulties with the Chinese language. Prajñāruci's translation of this same *Vimśatikā*, done possibly a quarter of a century earlier than Paramārtha's, under the Eastern Wei Dynasty (A. D. 534-550),³⁸ reveals even greater wordi-

³⁸ See Bagchi, *Le canon bouddhique en Chine*, vol. I, p. 263, No. (13). Nanjio, no. 1238, follows a mistaken ascription of this translation to Bodhiruci of the Northern Wei Dynasty (A. D. 386-534). Later catalogs have not infrequently confused Prajñāruci and Bodhiruci; cf. Bagchi, p. 261.

ness, and a tendency to paraphrase which, while true to the general meanings of the treatise, can scarcely be called literal accord with the Sanskrit sentences. We may not suppose, therefore, that Paramārtha's lost *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun* escaped its share of clumsy expressions which, together with its unfinished state and the complexities of its doctrine troubled the mind of the pilgrim scholar, and caused him to single it out for special attention in his journey to the West. Such devotion, also, would seem to indicate that so far as systematic rational statement of his Buddhism was concerned Hsüan Chuang was already committed to the Wei Shih Philosophy by the time he was ready to leave China.

(2). Turning now to the second period of the pilgrim's life, the years A. D. 629-645 while he was abroad, it is evident that Hsüan Chuang's interest in this particular Wei Shih treatise remained central, though the entire scope of his studies greatly widened. In Hui Li's biography the work is now spoken of as the *Yogaśāstra* (瑜伽論), sometimes by its full name as the *Yogācāryabhūmiśāstra* (瑜伽師地論). We find the pilgrim thoroughly indignant with the priest Mokṣagupta for belittling it, asking the latter whether he was not afraid of the bottomless pit, seeing that the *śāstra* was received from Maitreya, the future Buddha himself.³⁷ Visiting Ayodhyā, the country where Asaṅga and Vasubandhu had lived and taught, he carefully collected local legends concerning the two brothers and their contacts with Maitreya in the Tūṣita heaven, tales which were to make interesting reading in his Memoirs later.³⁸ Captured by robbers not long afterward he made his preparation for anticipated death by concentrating on the thought of Maitreya and his heaven, in order to be reborn there and to learn the *Yogaśāstra* from the heavenly Bodhisattva for himself.³⁹ Actually, however, he gained his greatest wisdom concerning the contents of the treatise from Śīlabhadra, the learned head priest of the great monastery at Nālandā, a teacher who stood in the direct line of transmission of the Wei Shih Philosophy. For Śīlabhadra, so Hsüan Chuang tells us in his Memoirs,⁴⁰ was the most eminent

³⁷ Beal, *Life*, p. 39.

³⁸ Beal, *Life*, p. 85. See also his *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, vol. I, pp. 226-229.

³⁹ Beal, *Life*, pp. 87-88.

⁴⁰ See Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, vol. II, pp. 110-11.

disciple of Dharmapāla, who in turn was the author of the best commentary on Vasubandhu's greatest work in Mahāyānist idealism, the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*.⁴¹ Hsüan Chuang at last had his Yoga-śāstra explained to him by the chief master of the Wei Shih doctrine in the India of his day. He there laid the foundation for his own translation which superseded Paramārtha's *Shih-ch'i-ti-lun*. We read that Hsüan Chuang listened to Śīlabhadra explain the Yoga-śāstra no less than three times during his stay at Nālandā Monastery.⁴² This was evidently the peak of his experience with the treatise which he had especially set out to investigate. There is record of his consulting other teachers outside Nālandā about it, but in one case the explanations given were inferior to those of Śīlabhadra,⁴³ while in another the teacher had himself studied the work under Śīlabhadra.⁴⁴ It was not without substantial reason, therefore, that upon leaving Nālandā Hsüan Chuang expressed special gratitude to Śīlabhadra for his expositions of the Yoga treatise.⁴⁵

This treatise, however, on the seventeen stages of religious advance, important as it was in Hsüan Chuang's affections, is not the only Wei Shih treatise nor the one most elaborated philosophically. How far do we have record of the way in which the pilgrim occupied himself while in India with the other more psychological and metaphysical analyses of the school?

We have already seen how Hsüan Chuang studied and lectured on Asaṅga's "Comprehensive Treatise on the Mahāyāna" before leaving China. We have seen also how he became acquainted with the systematic mind of Vasubandhu in the Hīnayāna treatise of Abhidharmakośa. Our biography is silent, however, as to just when and where he first studied Vasubandhu's advanced Mahāyāna work, the *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, *Trimśikā* (唯識三十論) which is the culminating treatise of the idealistic school. There is evidence that he met with one priest noted for special wisdom in this *śāstra* before he arrived at Nālandā. Vinītaprabha (毘膩

⁴¹ Hsüan Chuang's *Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun* (成唯識論) makes principal use of Dharmapāla's commentary (Nanjio, no. 1197).

⁴² Beal, *Life*, p. 121.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, pp. 139-40.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 153.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 169.

多鉢臘婆) of the kingdom of China-bhukti (至那僕底)⁴⁶ was a monk of princely birth and the author of commentaries on Vasubandhu's Pañcaskandhasāstra (五蘊論) and the Vijñaptimātrātsiddhi, Trīmśikā (唯識三十論). It is recorded that Hsüan Chuang remained with him for fourteen months, studying the Pañcaskandha and some other *sāstras*.⁴⁷ The Trīmśikā is not definitely mentioned among these, but it would be strange if Hsüan Chuang had not learned some of Vinītaprabha's ideas about it. More definite evidence of direct study of Wei Shih doctrines is found in his contacts with one Jayasena (勝軍論師), who lived a secluded yet busy life as scholar and teacher on Yaṣṭivana Mountain (杖林山), not far, apparently, from Nālandā.⁴⁸ As a Master of Sāstras (論師) his interests must have been primarily philosophical. With him Hsüan Chuang studied a Treatise on the "Solution of Difficulties of the Wei Shih" (唯識決擇論). First and last, Hsüan Chuang put in about two years with this master and to such good purpose that Śīlabhadra eventually appointed Hsüan Chuang to expound this work as well as Asaṅga's Mahāyānasamparigrahasāstra (攝大乘論) before the great congregation at Nālandā. All this undoubtedly involved developing a thorough knowledge of Vasubandhu's main treatise on the idealistic philosophy. In fact we find that when Hsüan Chuang, having started on his return journey to China, met two fellow-students from Nālandā at one of his halting places, their discourse turned upon Vasubandhu's two classic expositions, the Abhidharmakośa and the Vijñaptimātrātsiddhi as natural themes familiar to all of them.⁴⁹

(3). On Hsüan Chuang's attention to Wei Shih in the third period of his life we can be brief. It was the period of his translating activity after his arrival at Ch'ang-An in A. D. 645. Among the seventy-five works done into Chinese between the years A. D. 645-662 there are eighteen pertaining directly to the Wei Shih Philosophy. Beginning with the Sandhinirmocana-sūtra (解深

⁴⁶ T. Watters, *On Yuan Chuang*, vol. I, p. 292; Beal, *Life*, p. 76.

⁴⁷ Nanjio, nos. 1176, 1266, 1223. The Tui-fa-lun (對法論) is not listed in Nanjio. The Large Buddhist Encyclopedia says that it is the same as 阿毘達磨雜集論; see 佛學大辭典, 2588 上.

⁴⁸ Beal, *Life*, pp. 153-4.

⁴⁹ Beal, *Life*, p. 190.

密經)⁵⁰ in the year of his arrival he proceeded steadily through the important works of Asaṅga, of the mythical Maitreya and of Vasubandhu, bringing the whole to its great synthesis in the translation of the ten-fold commentary, by Dharmapāla and others, on Vasubandhu's "Treatise of Thirty Gāthās on Representation Only", the Ch'eng-wei-shih-lun (成唯識論) in A. D. 659. It is significant that out of ninety-four *śāstras* of the Mahāyānist variety listed in Nanjio's catalog, Hsüan Chuang is the translator of twenty-five and that out of these twenty-five seventeen are treatises of the Wei Shih School. These translations have been standard for this school of thought ever since, and it was to these translations of his master that the disciple K'uei-chi (窺基) wrote commentaries in further exposition of the doctrine.

So far we have treated of Hsüan Chuang's relation to the Wei Shih Philosophy in terms of the personalities and the circumstances under which his knowledge and interest in the doctrines developed. Can we touch the great internal problem as to the influences of Hsüan Chuang's mind upon the material in the process of transmission? The writer can bear testimony from experience with but two texts only, the original Sanskrit and Hsüan Chuang's translation of Vasubandhu's "Treatise of Twenty Gāthās on Representation Only."⁵¹ He is as yet very much in the midst of the study. But so far he has been able to observe the following:

(1). The fidelity of Hsüan Chuang to his text. It is a much more difficult matter to detect deviations than it is to see the closeness with which Hsüan Chuang follows the Sanskrit words and phrases. Although Sanskrit is an inflected language and Chinese is not, Hsüan Chuang manages, by the use of appropriate particles to equate all the essential constructions of the Indian text. When his style becomes involved it is always because the original is compressed and pregnant with too many implications. Rather than indulge in paraphrase he prefers to set down sentences of equal brevity and implication even at the risk of obscurity. Vasubandhu, writing for his own philosophical compeers, could take many things for granted which could not be immediately clear to Chinese priests without much explanation. Nevertheless Hsüan

⁵⁰ Nanjio, no. 247.

⁵¹ Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi, Viṃśatikā (唯識二十論).

Chuang interjects surprisingly few words of an explanatory character. Thus when the subject of sense organs and sense objects is introduced in the eighth gāthā,⁵² the Chinese text mentions that there are ten of these, whereas the Sanskrit says nothing about their number. But Hsüan Chuang does not go on as does Prajñārucci in the earlier Wei Dynasty translation to list off “colored, fragrant, tasting etc. external objects” (色香味等外諸境), the a, b, c, of Buddhist psychological analysis. Noteworthy also is the fact that Hsüan Chuang very seldom resorts to transliteration of Sanskrit words. He uses Chinese words that translate meaning instead. Where he does use transliteration it is for place names or names of persons where meanings are unimportant.⁵³ But such technical terms as the following are carefully translated and used consistently throughout the treatise:

<i>viññaptimātra</i>	唯識
<i>artha</i>	外境
<i>saṃtāna</i>	相續
<i>vāsanā</i>	熏習
<i>āyatana</i>	處
<i>dharma</i>	法
<i>dharmanāirātmya</i>	法無我
<i>rupādi</i>	色等

The list could be greatly extended.

(2). If we are agreeably disappointed, however, in not discovering more definite divergence between Hsüan Chuang's translation and his text, it is possible to indicate one point of discrepancy which does make difficulty for the student and which raises a question, at least, that calls for further understanding. Throughout the treatise Hsüan Chuang translates the two Sanskrit words *viññāna* and *viññapti* by one and the same term, namely 識. Now *viññāna* means “the act of distinguishing, discerning, understanding”. It is the active process of consciousness itself. Our word “consciousness” is probably the best synonym for it in Vasu-

⁵² Numbered according to the Chinese text. There are really twenty-two gāthās in the Sanskrit text, but in Hsüan Chuang's translation the first and last are treated as introduction and conclusion respectively, while those in between bear the numbering up to twenty.

⁵³ E. g. 迦溼彌羅國 for Kashmir and 毗婆沙師 for Vaibhāṣikas. But for Vaiśeṣikas he uses 勝論者; i. e. The Śāstra Conquerors.

bandhu's usage. And the Chinese word *shih* (識), "to know, to become aware of, to comprehend", is a practically complete equivalent for *viññāna* in that language. Thus when Vasubandhu asks the question in connection with the fifth gāthā concerning transformations of horrific beings in Hell, *Vijñānasyāiva tatkārmabhis tathā pariñāmaḥ kasman neṣyate*,⁵⁴ we translate, "Why is transformation in this fashion because of deeds not admitted as of consciousness itself?" and Hsüan Chuang renders it exactly, bringing out the emphasis on consciousness by making it the subject of his statement, 何緣不許識甲業力如是轉變 ("Why do you not admit that consciousness because of the force of deeds⁵⁵ changes thus"). But *viññapti*, as contrasted with *viññāna*, seems to have with Vasubandhu more of the sense of the particular productive acts of consciousness by which it presents objects to itself. It points in the direction of the separate outcomes of the conscious, cognizing process rather than to the process itself. Thus when Vasubandhu wishes to speak of the unreality of dream perceptions in the seventeenth gāthā he uses the expression *viññaptir abhūtārthaviṣayā*,⁵⁶ which we understand as, "A *viññapti* having an unreal thing as its object." It is clear that *viññapti* here refers to the production of dream objects or representations which, though existing as transformations or modifications within consciousness, yet have no corresponding reality beyond consciousness. Now Hsüan Chuang for *viññapti* in this place uses the same word as before, *shih* (識). "In a dream", he says, "although there is no substantial object, consciousness may arise" (夢中境雖無實而識得起). This is clearly confusing, at least for the Western mind, unable to sense fine shades of meaning in the juxtaposition of Chinese characters. If we can understand *shih* (識) in the sense of an object or production of cognizing activity then we can make of it an equivalent of *viññapti*. But if we did not have the Sanskrit original by which to check the Chinese we would not know that such was surely the sense intended. The term is ambiguous.

Now this consideration is not an idle verbal quibble. It has a bearing upon the central content of the *Vijñaptimātra* or Wei Shih

⁵⁴ S. Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 5, eighth line from top of page.

⁵⁵ I. e. in accordance with the law of karma.

⁵⁶ S. Lévi, *Vijñaptimātratāsiddhi*, p. 9, ninth line from top of page.

philosophy. Before the recovery of Vasubandhu's two treatises, scholars, being confined to the terms of the Chinese translations largely, have not infrequently described this doctrine as teaching that the world is "consciousness only", or *viññānamātra*. In a sense this is true. For from Vasubandhu's standpoint, consciousness presenting itself to itself is all that is. But as we read his treatises we can see that the drive of his argument is to prove that the seemingly external, substantial world is but the fabrication of our own consciousness, the purpose being to free us from the fear of it and from attachment to it: *idaṃ sarvaṃ viññaptimātrakam*,⁵⁷ "All this world is representation only".⁵⁸ *Viññaptimātra*, therefore, is a more definite slogan of the actual contention of Vasubandhu than *viññānamātra*. But Hsüan Chuang coins no special phrase to make the distinction overt.

The writer hesitates, nevertheless, to assert that Hsüan Chuang has hereby changed or reinterpreted the teaching of the school. One would have to examine the question through all his translations in order to draw conclusions, whereas most of these yet await adequate treatment by scholars. The task would require collaboration of both Indologists and Sinologists. It is, furthermore, not likely that Hsüan Chuang, studying in early manhood with the masters of Indian Buddhism when it was a living religion, would misunderstand their main import. An alternate hypothesis is that Hsüan Chuang, utilizing the word 識 in both of the senses signalized by the Sanskrit words, deliberately set it down for both *viññāna* and *viññapti*, either depending upon accompanying verbal comment to his students or trusting them to sense the different uses from the context. At any rate he was not anticipating the difficulties of Westerners in the intellectual climate of another age and place. The question, therefore, of Hsüan Chuang's contribution to the Wei Shih doctrine in the process of transmission, remains from the standpoint of this study undecided.

It is hoped that the considerations here adduced will have made it abundantly clear that Hsüan Chuang, in addition to his general purpose to augment and improve available Buddhist literature in

⁵⁷ From the *Trīṃśikā*, *Kārikā* 17. Lévi, p. 35, ninth line from top. See also Poussin, *Viññaptimātratāsiddhi*, vol. I, p. 416.

⁵⁸ It is to be observed that Professor Stcherbatskoi, utilizing Tibetan texts, selected this formula for Vasubandhu's position many years ago; see *Le Museon*, 1905, p. 155.

China, possessed a specific interest in an advanced phase of Mahāyānist philosophical reflection which is only beginning to come seriously within the ken of Western scholarship. Investigation of this philosophy may be expected to throw light not only upon the intellectual culture of the T'ang Dynasty but upon certain contemporary strains of Buddhist reflection in the Far East.

THE DIVINITY OF KINGS

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS

YALE UNIVERSITY

THE ORIGINAL "human god," *mānuṣyadeva*, in India is the priest, or according to some texts, the scholarly priest; for one may be born to the caste and yet, if not initiated into it and later instructed in the sacred learning, one will not be a real priest and not entitled to priestly distinction. But such a restriction as this is ignored in the older Veda, where gods are very simply divided into two classes, invisible and visible, the latter being Brahmans (TS. 1. 7. 3. 1). The epic steers a middle course and says that any (Brahman) priest is a god, but when he is wise and learned he is "more of a god", *avidvān brāhmaṇo devaḥ vidvān bhūyastaro devaḥ*." In either case he is still a *dāivatam mahat*, a great divinity (13. 152. 20 f.).

This last is the expression used also of a king in the epic, but there is this difference between the two divinities. The godhead of the priest is not conferred upon him; he is born to it and only one born divine, so to speak, is at this period a priest. Kingship on the other hand is an attribute which may be bestowed on a member of other than the warrior-caste and in any case a king becomes divine only by virtue of a religious ritual, in which the mere man by consecration and baptism at inauguration assumes a divine nature. The war-god Indra is the natural prototype of the warrior-king and a verse in the earliest Veda addressed to Indra is in the later Atharva transferred to the king. Following this lead, the priestly ritual literature identifies the king with several divinities. Whatever his parentage (that is, of whatever caste), the king rules as divine; he and the priest together uphold the moral order. The Rg-Veda recognized a king as a demigod, *ardhadeva*, but even then apparently only when he was a conqueror. The next period, a few centuries later, identifies every properly inaugurated king, by virtue of his mystic consecration, with the great gods. He is "anointed with the glory of the Fire-god, with the radiance of the Sun-god, with the power of Indra". It is the gods that confer upon him "radiance, power, and might." The radiance, *varcas*, is united with the fiery energy, *haras*, which the Father of gods conferred upon Indra and is symbolized by a gold crown. The king only by

being united with the holy power, *brahma*, becomes divine, and is, as it were, brahmanized, made one with the Brahman, to whom, as his domestic priest, he is literally wedded (in the words of the marriage ritual). Priest and king swear mutual fidelity and thus the king becomes "lord of the whole earth and guardian of the law". But even in the account of this ritual it is clear that in ordinary belief and parlance a king was still a human being as distinct from a divine being. Thus, to illustrate the honor paid to the god Soma as king and guest, it is casually said that Soma the *divine* king should receive what is due to a guest, "for when a *human* king comes as guest they kill an ox for him," and "human kings" are in the same work spoken of as antithetic to gods, and as mortal compared with immortals.¹

This is the attitude adopted toward kings throughout the early literature. Royal divinity is recognized as a matter of form useful to statesmen and rather haltingly taken over by the law, where the feeling was perhaps that one sort of human god was enough. At any rate, almost the only recognition of a king's divinity in the period of the early law-books is the statement in Vasiṣṭha (Dh. S. 19. 48) that "the taint of impurity does not fall on kings, because they occupy Indra's place", *āindram sthānam upāsīnāḥ*, that is, for the convenience of legal procedure, the king, who presides at a court of law, is to be considered free from the many impositions of ritual impurity attaching to other men. Nowhere else is a king's divinity remarked upon except that Gāutama says that those who are not priests ought to show reverence for him by sitting on a lower seat and even priests ought to show him honor (G. 11. 7-8). Nor is this because space is economized and the authors of law-manuals deliberately omit passages, such as are found in the later law and the epic, magnifying royal divinity; for both Bāudhāyana and Vasiṣṭha are apt to cite verses of others and Gāutama has a couple of chapters especially devoted to the king as a man and a state-figure. Kāuṭilya uses the same argument as Vasiṣṭha. Kings occupy the position of gods and hence should be honored and obeyed.² Gāutama, on the other hand, does not say that a king should be honored

¹ AB. 1. 15; 8. 23 f. For the ritual, see *ib.* 7. 22 f.; 8. 11 f.; ŚB. 3. 2. 1. 40; 5. 3. 3. 9 and 12; 5. 4. 4. 5; TS. 3. 5. 3. 2, etc., and for a thorough discussion of the origin of kingship, with further references, see U. Ghoshal, *A History of Hindu Political Theories*, 1923.

² Ghoshal, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

as a god. The only reason he gives for the king's immunity is that it is practical not to hamper the king's business-activities, *kārya-virodhāt* (G. 14. 15). These works make a natural verbal distinction between king, gods, and priests, as when Gāutama speaks of witnesses giving an oath in the presence of "the gods, the king, and the priests", *devarājabrahmaṇasaṃsadi* (13. 13). So Āpastamba separates the verbal abuse of gods from that of the king, as if a king were not a god, *paraṣaṃ devatānām rājñāś ca* (1. 31. 5). But that is not significant; nor is it an argument against his divinity that a king on failing to perform his regular duties must pay a penance and becomes sinful (*enasvī rājā*, G. 12. 45; *prāyaścitti*, ib. 48; *rājānam enaḥ sprśati*, Āp. 2. 28. 13). It is rather the absence of the insistence on divinity that is striking, the lack of the claim, made so often in Manu and the epic, that the king is "a great divinity".

For Vasiṣṭha says, only as quoted above, that the king occupies Indra's place; but Manu, who has the same words (5. 93), is not content with this, but amplifies it, saying that a king incarnates eight gods, Moon, Fire, Sun, Wind, Indra, Kubera, Varuṇa, and Yama (ib. 95), and then reiterates this (7. 4) in the statement that the Lord, for the protection of the world, created a king from the eternal elements of Indra, Wind, Yama, Sun, Fire, Varuṇa, Moon, and Kubera. "Hence the king excels in glory; he burns like the sun and none may look upon him. Even though a child he is not to be despised as a human being, for he is a powerful divinity in human form", ib. 8). This theme is treated again in Manu (9. 303), where it is said that the king is like the (divine) Earth, for, like earth, he supports all. Earth here takes the place of Kubera in the other lists and not only is the king shown to be like all these gods in a detailed analysis of characteristics, but he is identified also with the different ages, which correspond to the classic golden age, etc. He is in fact the age because "as is the king so are his people", and dependent on him are the people's virtue and prosperity. Even when Gāutama cites the Brahmanic dictum that the priest and king together uphold the laws and activities of the world (ŚB. 5. 4. 4. 5; G. 8. 1, *dhṛtavratāu*),³ he never approaches this sort of deification. A king thus glorified

³ The king as ruler of earth, *sarvabhūmi*, is also guardian of the law, *dharmasya goptā*, as representing *dharmapati* Varuṇa (cf. VS. 9. 39; ŚB. 5. 3. 3. 9; and AB. 8. 11).

however, is all the more responsible for the the welfare of his people and this double view of the king is the one that prevails in the epic. A great divinity, but woe be to him if he fails to live up to his character! Almost it would seem that he loses his divinity if he disgraces it by a failure to protect and support his people and inspire them with virtue. It is even suggested in the Rāmāyaṇa that it is only the king's supernatural goodness which makes him a god: "They say a king is human, *rājānaṃ mānuṣaṃ prāhuḥ*, but you, on account of your more than human conduct seem to me to be godlike" (R. 2. 102 = G. 111. 4). This "they say" is certainly an indication of popular opinion. Another passage in the same epic asserts that a king who neglects the affairs of the citizens will be roasted in airless hell.⁴ It is the king's duty to supply a means of life for all his people. He is the *sarvārthsādhaka*, "accomplisher of everything", upon whom his people live, *upajīvanti*, the tree of life, the farmer's rain-cloud, a god among men, "a great divinity"; his form is human but himself divine (12. 75. 15). He has five forms. He is Fire, Sun, Death, the god of wealth, and the god of judgment (12. 68. 40 f.); he is Law incorporate (1. 49. 8, *dharmo vighrahavān*). The group of five reappears in the Rāmāyaṇa (3. 40. 12), though differently elucidated: *pañca rūpāṇi rājāno dhārayanty amitāujasaḥ, agner indrasya somasya yamasya varunasya ca* (indicated by royal characteristics, that of Varuṇa, for example, being shown by *prasannaṭā*, "clarity" as serenity, graciousness). But whatever the grouping the conclusion is always the same, *manyāḥ pūjyāś ca nityadā*, kings should always be honored and revered as gods. A god and yet not wholly a god, for besides having a *nararūpa*, "human form" the king is "somewhat human" (*kiṃcid bhavati mānuṣaḥ*), though born of Soma, Indra, Sūrya, Kubera, Yama (RG. 7. 64. 14 f. a *prakṣipta* passage). Manu's eight gods become five in both epics, though the "five forms" interchange to such an extent that the Mbh. list (above) has Sun, Death, Kubera as against R's Indra, Soma, Varuṇa, so that only

⁴ R. 7. 53. 6: *pāurakāryāṇi yo rājā na karoti dine dine, samvṛtte narake ghere patito nā'tra saṃśayaḥ* (RG. 55. 6, *sa mṛto* for *saṃvṛtte*, "stifling," and *pacyate* for *patito*). As to the conduct of the people being dependent on that of the king, compare R. 7. 43. 19, *yathā hi kurute rājā prajā(s) tam anuvartate*, which in RG. 46. 19 appears as *yacchilo hi bhaved rājā tacchilā ca prajā bhavet*. Compare also RG. 3. 10. 12, and for a wider view of the effect of the king on the people's conduct and prosperity, see Hesiod, *Works and Days*, 240.

Fire and Yama coincide in the two lists of five forms. Death, Mr̥tyu or Antaka, is the form of the king when exterminating the "unclean", root and branch, applied especially to his conquered foes, who are to be slain "families and ministers and all". It is obvious that the divinity of the king in all these descriptions wavers between identification with gods in essence and in quality. In fact, in the same account the statement is that the king "is" the god and that he "is like" the god. When the king wins a battle, then he is, or is like, Indra; "to us thou art Indra, as it were", *Indra iva no bhavān* (ib. 16). When he is serene and kind, or wrathfully slays sinners, then he is like some other god, or he incorporates the god. The epic poets in this regard are not exact in thought or utterance but one thing they never say. They never say that the king is like a great divinity. The king is a great divinity; he is like this or that god. So it really makes no difference whether one epic poet says the king is like Fire and another that he is like Death. Just so the epic as a whole has left off identifying the king (in these groups of five or eight) with Brahman and Rudra. The Vedic age (VS. 10. 27 f.) says: "thou art Brahman, thou art Savitar, thou art gentle Rudra", etc. The new series of identifications is extended and now shows more clearly that it is the function rather than the god which is in the poet's mind. Through the function is made the identification in quality, which in turn identifies the king with the god: "Seven are the qualities of a king as stated by Manu Prajāpati; he is mother, father, teacher, protector, Fire, Kubera, Yama" (*mātā pitā gurur goptā vahnir vāśra-vaṇo yamaḥ* (12. 139. 103 f.). Perhaps the simplest and most common creed is that expressed in 12. 72. 25 f.: *Indro rājā yamo rājā dharmo rājā tathā'iva ca; rājā bibharti rūpāṇi rājñā sarvām idaṃ dhṛtam*, "the king is the battle-god, the king is the god of future judgment, the king is the god of law and order; he has the forms (of gods); he upholds the universe".

Royal divinity of the old type slightly modified thus lingers into the epic age. But in this period arises a new conception of the king as a divine incarnation. Thus the divinity of Pṛthu Vāinya is not established on the fact that this old king was, or represented, nature-gods and the divinities of law and of future judgment, but on the fact that, because he was virtuously ascetic, "Viṣṇu entered his body, and so the world bows to this king as to a god among human gods" (*tapasā bhagavān Viṣṇur āviveśa ca bhūmipam*,

devavan naradevānām namate yaṁ jagan nṛpam, 12. 59. 128). And so with one stroke godhead becomes incarnate. On this model is established the divinity of Rāma and of Kṛṣṇa; they are Viṣṇu in human form. A general principle is established. A royal soul, when its merit is exhausted, descends from heaven and "is born a king united with Viṣṇu's greatness", *mahattvena saṁyukto vāiṣṇavena*, and hence "he obtains wisdom and majesty", *buddhi* and *māhātmya*; he is "established by the gods and no one over-rules him" (*ativartate*, ib. 134).

That royalty is divinity remains a fixed principle to the present time. When the plague broke out in Bombay just after some miscreants had insulted the statue of Queen Victoria, it was believed (by the pious) that the disease was the revenge inflicted by her as insulted divinity. In accordance with this belief, *deva* and *devī* became as early as the epic age titles of politeness addressed to king and queen, while "earth-god" and "man-god" were applied to king as well as to priest (*kṣitideva* and *naradeva*), though sometimes *nṛdeva*, "man-god", as king, was placed in antithesis to *bhūmideva*, "earth-god", as priest (R. 7. 53. 8). It is on the old convention (that the king represents Indra) that Rāma as king may accept a gift from a seer (*āindreṇa bhāgena pratigrhṇīṣva* (R. 7. 76. 33 f.)). No need to show how *nṛdeva* (1. 56. 6) becomes expanded into *naradevadeva*, "god of the gods among men" (5. 30. 1), and *devadeva*, "god of gods", without qualification (R. 2. 58. 18). If a king is a god among men, an emperor is naturally "god of gods". No need either to show the incongruity of the title *devī Vāidehī* addressed to Sītā by Hanumat, followed by his explanation that, because she wept and sighed and touched earth, he was soon convinced that she was not a divinity but plain human Sītā; *na tvī devīm aham manye* (R. 5. 33. 10). The *devaliṅgāni* are well known: real gods do not wink or sweat or get dusty or touch earth as they walk, or cast a shadow, and their garlands never fade; and, apparently, real goddesses do not weep or sigh.⁵

And as Nala, who is an inaugurated king and therefore should be a "great divinity", stands in contrast to the gods and shows no signs of divinity or supernatural powers except as the real gods give

⁵ 3. 37. 24 f.; RG. 3. 63. 18 f. (Bomb. 56, *prakṣipta*), where Indra is revealed: *prthivīm nā'spṛśat padbhyām animeṣekṣaṇāni ca* (v. l. *animeṣekṣaṇo babhāu*), *arajo'mbaradhārī ca na mlānakusumas tathā*. Even a goblin casts no shadow and has unwinking eyes (Jāt. 546).

him magical ability, so the epic emperor Yudhiṣṭhira is devoid of divinity. It is said rather belatedly (7. 190. 56) that his war-car did not touch the ground till he told a lie; but that trait (of which the early epic in the countless stories of his battles gives no intimation) has nothing to do with divinity, it is the result of his truthfulness and general virtuousness; for very virtuous people can always walk on water and skim over the ground, as did Pṛthu Vāinya, even before "Viṣṇu entered him," as related in the story told above (he could walk on water, which solidified when he wanted to walk over the seas: *āpas tastambhire cā'sya samudram abhiyāsyataḥ*, 12. 59. 123). Rāma is divine as the incarnation of Viṣṇu, not as being otherwise a god (R. 6. 35. 35), *Rāmaṃ manyāmahe Viṣṇuṃ mānuṣaṃ rūpaṃ āsthitam*, or, as in G, *Viṣṇuṃ Rāmaṃ ahaṃ manye mānuṣaṃ chadmarūpiṇam*). He is astonished at his own deification: *ātmaṇaṃ mānuṣaṃ manye*, "I regard myself as human" (ib. 119. 11). Since Sītā is a woman who looks on her husband as a god anyway, *patidevatā* (R. 6. 116. 13), which is a woman's normal creed (*patir hi devatā nāryāḥ*, R. 7. 48. 17), she is not much impressed by Rāma's added divinity, nor even by her own identification with Viṣṇu's wife (*Sītā Lakṣmī bhavān Viṣṇur devaḥ Kṛṣṇaḥ Prajāpatih*, R. 6. 119. 27). Rāma remains not merely a great divinity but the supreme deity (*eṣa te dāivatam param*, G. 6. 104. 44), whose being embraces all other gods.⁶

The epic Pārtha heroes are all born of gods and even the monkey-king Sugrīva is son of the Sun-god and is addressed as *deva* by Dadhimukha (*dadhipūrvamukho namnā* R. 6. 22. 85). Godship of a sort is inherent in heroes as it was in Greece, where a hero revered "as a god" was no novelty. "Gods who were men" are recognized even before the epic period as part of the pantheon. A king as a great divinity, wearing a crown symbolic of his divine "glory" is recognized from the Vedic period onward; the idea cannot have been imported from Persia. As a matter of daily practice and belief, however, the position of a king in India was probably like that of the Persian monarchs. Cyrus thought he was more than human by birth; but he was not surprised or annoyed when Cræsus suggested that he was only human (Hd. 1. 204 and 207). Apart from the formal declaration in discussions of kingship that a king

⁶ The commentator takes *Kṛṣṇaḥ* (above) to refer to Rāma's dark color; obviously it means the other claimant to supreme godhead.

represents divinity and "is not to be despised as a human being", neither epic nor drama treats a king as a god; he is called *deva*, but his divinity stops with his title till he appears officially, when it is remembered that "there's such divinity doth hedge a king", as makes treason impious and disrespect an act of profanity. When the king doffs his official robes and appears among other men, at receptions, in sport, or in battle, no one recognizes him as supernatural in any way and in the epic he is seldom honored even perfunctorily with the polite *deva*, though in the (later) drama this address becomes as common and doubtless as meaningless as "Sir" or "my lord" in English.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. Von HANS BAUER und PONTUS LEANDER. Halle/Saale: MAX NIEMEYER, 1927. Pp. x + 381.

Kurzgefasste Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen. Von HANS BAUER und PONTUS LEANDER. Halle/Saale: MAX NIEMEYER, 1927. Pp. 81.

Laut- und Formenlehre des Ägyptisch-Aramäischen. (Göteborgs Högskolas Årsskrift XXXIV, 1928:4). Von P. LEANDER. Göteborg: WETTERGREN & KERBERS FÖRLAG, 1928. Pp. 135.

The Aramaic of the Old Testament. A Grammatical and Lexical Study of its Relations with other Early Aramaic Dialects. By H. H. ROWLEY. Oxford: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1929. Pp. xiv + 161.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel, with Introduction, Indexes and a New English Translation. By R. H. CHARLES. Oxford: CLARENDON PRESS, 1929. Pp. cxxviii + 408.

Within a few years have appeared a number of notable contributions (*e. g.*, the monographs by G. R. Driver and Baumgartner) to Biblical Aramaic, that science of many aliases, for which a new name deserves to be invented in view of the great enlargement of its scope. In the forefront of books on the subject now stands Bauer and Leander's comprehensive Grammar of the dialect, which in fulness and detail is a peer of the same authors' *Historical Grammar of the Hebrew*. They have paid full compliment to their subject, and the need of such an undertaking is evident in view of the fact that we have had no comprehensive grammar on the subject for nigh fifty years, Kautzsch's Grammar having appeared in 1884. Apart from the contributions which the present work gives from the newer Semitic philology of the past half-century, it has for additional basic material the new fund of the Elephantine papyri, not to speak of the important monumental texts which have come to light; and in addition the Bible manuscripts with the Babylonian punctuation, which have slowly seen the light through the labors

of Kahle and others and which are invaluable for the traditional pronunciations of the Aramaic texts. All this new material has now been thoroughly digested and incorporated, to the vast advantage of scholarship. In regard to the extent of the work the question may be raised whether it is not too elaborate in view of the paucity of material, and whether much of the purely historical treatment might not have been assumed as posited in the authors' Hebrew Grammar, with which the present volume runs *pari passu*. We might have expected some treatment of the Biblical text, the manuscripts and editions of which are notoriously contradictory, and also a fuller criticism of the Masoretic traditions. Thus the Bab. vocalization of the Pass. Kal *guli* is of great interest as over against Tib. *gēli* (§ 47, t); on the other hand Bab. *kētol* for *ketal*, Dan. 3:22, is so obviously erroneous that it is hardly worth noting except as a sport, but see § 32, a. v. However, this ambition for fulness of material has given the invaluable tables of all verb forms with Tib. punctuation and all noun forms, §§ 50, 56-66.

Some details of this rich work may now be commented on. The present writer does not at all agree with the position taken in regard to the original Semitic accent (§ 4), which he regards as originally penultimate, in this feature the Aramaic having remained the most primitive among Semitic languages. Its distinct characteristic is the sharp accentuation of the penult which caused the shortening where possible of all other vowels, e. g., *kēṭālú*, and with subsequent loss of the final open vowel as in Syriac. Survivals of this genuine characteristic are found in the Masora in *hitgezéret*, Dan. 2:34, *hitkeríyat*, 7:15, to be accented however on the penult, not as with the Mas. on the ultimate. With regard to the vowels I can but express scepticism towards the finesse of operation of the authors working on traditions of pronunciation contaminated by later Aramaic dialects as well as by the alien Hebrew. Is the Aramaic *e* (cf. § 5, e seq., etc.) pointed with *šêrê* anything else than a *seghol* in many cases, as the Syriac shows, e. g. *mēlek*, not *mēlêk*, *yēkeltā*, not *yēkeltā*, with the Mas. and our authors, § 18, a? Mas. *beṭēlat*, Ezr. 4:24, is to be regarded as *beṭīlat* or *beṭēlat* as over against the labored explanation in § 18, x. For the origin of the "Article", i. e. the ending *-â* of the Emphatic (better with their term, Determinate) State, our Grammar finds it in an original postfixed demonstrative *hâ*, § 22; with this may be compared the similar attachment of *hû*, *hâ* in Ethiopic (Dill-

mann, *Eth. Gr.*, Eng. tr., § 172, to which may be added a number of adverbial forms); but with the South Arabic Determinate in (a)n we may not speak too positively of the origin of the Aramaic form. The authors are puzzled, p. 76, over the origin of the pronominal suffix *-êh*; but the solution seems to lie in the supposition that both *hû* and *hî* were available for the masc. suffix, hence *âhi* > *êh*; cf. the use of *-hi* in Syriac after the pronominal suffix of the verb as a mere determinative to the eye, e. g. *ketaltîy* plus unpronounced *hi*, "I killed him". In the treatment of the verb the authors follow with rigor their sharp distinction between the Aorist (vulgare Imperfect) and the Nominal (Perfect), following the method of their Hebrew Grammar, and devote pp. vi-ix of the Preface to a defence of their position; cf. further § 77. This schematic procedure appears somewhat cumbersome in the treatment of the scanty remains of a dialect. The so-called Nominal was actually a full-blown verb in Biblical-Aramaic, just as much as English "I have done" is a perfect, although built up from a nominal participle. If Perfect and Imperfect are unsatisfactory terms, is Aorist any more so, not to say Nominal? With all that has been said on the subject the Perfect and Imperfect may be distinguished as referring respectively to the abstract action and to the activity. The treatment of the Causative of the verb, § 36, makes it appear as though we have two independent dialectic forms *ha-* and *'a-* running alongside of each other in a brotherly way. Could one and the same writer have used both in successive gasps? The papyri and earlier inscriptions use *ha-* exclusively (Rowley, p. 80), and *'a* appears to be intrusive.

For *yittêšâm*, Dan. 5:6, see note in my *Commentary*; it is to be read *yittêšîm*, as the papyri show, rs. § 46, n. p. *Tâsêp*, Dan. 2:44, is regarded as a 'Kanaanäismus', p. 148; may it not be metrical after preceding *taddêk*? Against § 49, b the vowel of the impv. *šê* is due to the influence of the aleph. The explanations of the Hofals of *'atah* in § 49, f add no clarification. Under the Nouns the derivation of *sâ'ah* "moment" from Arab. *sa'at*, "extension" is absolutely wrong semantically; the form is participial and means "Augenblick", see my note to Dan. 3:16. Adverbial *gô* § 51, n. p, is an accusative from *gaywa* and is to be added to the cases in § 55, b; it occurs in Nabataean in a prepositional phrase, and cf. identical Arabic *jauw^{an}*. For the diminutive *kuṭail* form

may be noted Bevan's treatment of *kōbbēl* (not noticed by B. and L.) as a diminutive, similar to Arabic prepositional forms. P. 192, *'ikkār* is treated as an intensive form; but its development is similar to that of *liššān*. The fem. *'ōhōrî*, "other", is best explained from the Arabic, *vs.* p. 197. For *nēwālî* (*ibid.*, where its penultimate accent is not accounted for) see my note at Dan. 2:5. To the adverbs, § 68, o, should be added *ṭēwāt*, Dan. 6:19. In comparison with *'ad dî*, § 79, i, may be noted Arabic *'ad anna*, with the sense, "and at last".

Of particular novelty and excellence in the Syntax is the full treatment of the Verb and its variations between perf., impf., and ppl.; n. b. the translation of Dan. 7:2-14, § 83, illustrating the interplay of the verbal forms. It is this lively interplay that gives light and shadow to our early dialect, such as was lost to the later Syriac, but it agrees with ancient Semitic syntax, as in Hebrew and Akkadian poetry. To sum up, while exception is naturally challenged in many points by a work of such finesse and fulness, nevertheless Semitic philology is immensely enriched by it.

The accompanying Brief Grammar of Biblical Aramaic by Bauer and Leander gives in succinct form, 48 pages, along with full paradigms of verbs and nouns, all the beginner requires, and adds the Biblical texts, following Ginsburg's first edition (also used as basis of the large Grammar). The text itself, fortunately, is not disturbed by emendations, but a rich apparatus of notes with full vocabulary affords sufficient philological apparatus to the student. The beginner might well have been given some prefatory material on the extent of the early Aramaic field, of which students have the vaguest knowledge. We sorely miss such an elementary textbook in English, for which this excellent work might serve as a basis, except for the classification of the parts of the verb which would appear quite outlandish to youthful beginners.

Bauer and Leander's comprehensive Grammar of the Biblical Aramaic was soon followed by a similar treatment of the Egyptian dialect of the papyri and ostraka at the hands of Leander, undertaking a task, as he informs us, that had been planned by Dr. Cowley. This is the first thorough treatment of the subject, and it is carried out on the ample lines by which the author and his colleague Bauer have distinguished themselves. It is of practical convenience that the two "dialects" have been treated separately; and since the two grammars are worked out after identical plan

and in entire harmony, the comparison of the two is fully facilitated. It is needless to say that an admirable piece of work has been accomplished. All the material appears to have been gathered and put in proper place; there is a thorough nicety of treatment which would be worthy of a much larger literature. The full annotations at the bottom of almost every page give the necessary reference to the discussions of the various items, which in themselves constitute a large bibliography. Of great value is the attempt to present the proper vocalization of the consonantal texts. Thus the study of the Egyptian documents has at last been placed on a scientific basis.

Mr. Rowley's book is a classical specimen of a single-eyed thesis based on a full and carefully analyzed assembling of the material and set in a perfect logical form that proves his *quod erat demonstrandum*. It is the more remarkable when we read in the Preface that for most of the thirteen years of its compilation he has been engaged in other tasks in China. The thesis appears limited: to support the late Dr. Driver's contention that the philological data of the book require a dating after Alexander's conquest and that the Aramaic is "of the type spoken near Palestine"; but the thesis is one of prime importance both philologically and for Biblical criticism. Rowley's chief objective is the confutation of the late Professor R. Dick Wilson's arguments against Driver's position, which, as he holds, have never been specifically answered. (But cf. the brief discussion by G. R. Driver, "The Aramaic of the Bk. of Dan.", *JBL* 1926, 110-119, and the thorough and parallel discussion by Baumgartner, *ZAW* 1927, 81-133). He also counters similar arguments advanced by Boutflower in a large book and by Tisdall, and takes issue with the present reviewer (p. 13, note) for holding in his *Commentary* on Daniel (p. 20, note) that the papyri invalidate many of Driver's conclusions. I would now moderate my expression (yet for similar criticism cf. Baumgartner, p. 87, etc.), alleging withal that I never felt any patience with Wilson's general line of argumentation. It is impossible in these lines to present the rich character of the book. Under every head, orthoëpy, grammar, vocabulary, syntax, Rowley sums up all the germane material from the earliest Aramaic monuments to late Jewish Palestinian, Nabataean and Palmyrene, in carefully arranged collocations, followed by impartial discussion and findings. His final deduction is expressed in the last section of the Conclusion,

in which with some elaboration but with due caution he expresses his agreement with Driver that Daniel is not earlier than the fourth century and is Palestinian, while Ezra is not much earlier; to give a specific deduction, p. 63, on basis of the pronouns Ezra is nearer to the papyri, Daniel to Nabataean. Apart from the critical argument the array of materials is such as has not been attempted for comparative purposes and is an invaluable thesaurus for the student of early Aramaic dialects. Inter al. may be noted the comparative table of pronouns, pp. 57-61, such an item as the spellings in אֲ, הֲ, pp. 111-115, and the novel study of the variations in syntax, pp. 98-108 (with which compare now Bauer-Leander and Charles in his *Comm.*). The statement, p. 129, that Hebraisms are more common in the papyri than in the Biblical texts is of interest; of course the former material now bulks larger than the latter. A few annotations may be offered. To p. 91: the Kt. מִצִּיחַ, Dan. 4:21, is correct in the stative verb, as Torrey has argued. To p. 110 under (3) add כִּנְכַּר from the papyri. To p. 116: for צִבּוּ as "thing", Dan. 6:8, *vs.* Targum as "purpose", cf. the Heb. translation חֶפֶץ Ecc. 3:1; see my note *JBL* 1924, 241. To p. 144: הַמִּינִיחַ is a good Aramaic adverb, of an order common in Syriac; see my *Comm.*, 273; I do not find it noticed by Leander. An index of Semitic words were a desideratum in this most useful book.

On p. 49 Mr. Rowley takes exception to the present writer's attribution (*Comm.*, 18) of the varying use of final א and ה to "scribal confusion". I must still maintain that position with this addition, that considerable variation is due to the grammatical acrobacy of Soferim and Masoretes, a quality we have to admire in them, although it often led them into error even as it still seduces modern grammarians. For instance the unique spelling of the negative with לֹה, Dan. 4:32, is, I take it, a device to show that it is not the negative; see my *Comm.*, and add de Rossi, *Scholια critica*, ad loc. The same arbitrariness is found in the two spellings of זַעַם and מִלֶּךְ. As to the main question we lie too much under the ban of the notion of a Masoretic *textus receptus* even ad litteram. But after all, our editions, not to say the manuscripts, are the conflate work of men's hands. The scholar is wont to rely on some chosen text, Baer's, Kittel's, Ginsburg's, without thought of other good traditional as well as manuscriptal variants, and while we may speak of Masoretic authority for the Mediaeval age, that by no means

is authority for an earlier condition of the texts, not to say the autographs. For instance, I found that the German manuscripts have a more primitive form of spelling than the Italian which are taken as normative. On this very matter of final נ and ן (n. b. פשרא and פשרה in Dan. 2) the several different printed texts are constantly at odds on this point; and when one goes back to the earliest evidence, that of the versions, confusion is still more confounded, for there disagreement is found between the Old Greek and Theodotion, proving that the readings were already at variance. I cannot think that the composers of Aramaic Daniel, writers of fine literary ability, were constantly changing their spelling, not to say their dialects. The phenomenon was beginning to appear in the papyri, but for argument's sake we should have to draw statistics from the individual composers of the documents, reminding ourselves that these are for the most part not literary productions. Even inscriptions may be faulty in consequence of stone-masons' errors; see Kent, "The Textual Criticism of Inscriptions", in this JOURNAL, 1920, 289 ff., for Persian, Greek and Latin texts.

I doubt much whether we are in a position to draw a distinction between an Eastern and a Western dialect of Aramaic for the Biblical documents and their predecessors and contemporaries. The admixture of Eastern and Western in the later Jewish Aramaic should put us on guard here. The Ahikar Story is found in the Egyptian papyri, but hails from Assyria. Must not Ezra represent Babylonian Judaism, whether it be history or fiction? I hold in my *Comm.*, pp. 93, 96, on purely historical grounds, that Dan. 1-6 is of Babylonian origin. G. R. Driver speaks too positively (*JBL* 1926, 117) for the postulation of such an early differentiation. Others are now denying it, e. g. Baumgartner (*ZATW* 1927, 123), Bauer-Leander (p. 5), Charles (p. lxxix). We shall have to drop the older classification of Biblical Aramaic as Western, and there fail any criteria of the kind for theological or literary purpose in the Bible texts.

The object of philology is the understanding of speech and letters, hence Charles's new Commentary represents the apex in this series of volumes centring about Biblical Aramaic. All who knew him personally and all who are indebted to his manifold work must rejoice that the distinguished scholar was given the happy lot of rounding out a full programme of labor in the field of Judaistic Apocrypha and Apocalyptic, to which he has contributed more than

any other scholar ; following his Commentary on the New Testament Apocalypse with what proved to be his last book, the Apocalypse of the Old Testament, he must have felt that he had achieved the crown of his labors.

The book, now reviewed too belatedly, is rich and variegated, as we should expect from Charles's hands. An Introduction of 127 pages is followed by the Commentary, in which each section of Daniel is treated with proper prefaces, literary, philological, etc., the ensuing comment being given in large type ; at the end appears the translation based on a revised text, along with brief notes indicating and enforcing the changes from the Semitic text and cross-referencing to the Commentary—an especially useful part of the book as it enables the reader at once to observe the results and reasons of the author's criticism. The Introduction gives the writer's opinion as to the authorship, unity and date of the book, a rather brief account of the versions (the details of which he does not pursue in the Commentary), and a valuable and lengthy discussion of the characteristics of Biblical Aramaic in comparison with other remains of Old Aramaic, in which his work is largely parallel with Rowley's. It should be noticed that of the philological works reviewed above Charles had only Bauer and Leander's Grammar at hand. Along with these more extensive sections are given the other materials proper to introduction, historical, chronological, theological.

Charles's position as to the origin and original language of the book is most emphatic ; it comes from one hand, was all composed in Aramaic (so with Marti), and the Hebrew sections as we have them come from the hands of three different translators. To refute the position of Dalman and Torrey, to which the present reviewer attaches himself, that c. 7 is a translation from original Hebrew, thus classing it with the following chapters, he presents a long list of verbal and stylistic forms common to cc. 2-6 and c. 7 by way of proof of their identity of origin. But the main grounds he alleges for his opponents' position, p. xxxix, do not to the reviewer's mind, constitute the chief argument. Rather there is to be accentuated the distinction in subject matter, pure romance and pure apocalyptic, as between cc. 1-6 and 7-12, as also the more delicate question of style and diction. Further for Apocalyptic we should expect the last six chapters to be in Hebrew, the Holy Tongue. Uncertainty over c. 7 must be allowed, but when Charles proceeds

to state dogmatically in a brief section (§ 9, p. xlv) that "there is no *rational or conceivable ground* [*sic italics*] for the author's forsaking the vernacular language of his day and having recourse to Hebrew for the three remaining visions in 8-12" (with omission of 9:4-19 as an interpolated Hebrew prayer), he appears to make a rash statement as to linguistic conditions in Palestine for the age of the book; yet he allows, p. xviii, that a few years after its composition, by 161, or at the latest 153, the present Hebrew translations were made.

The reviewer must take sharp exception to another of Charles's positions. This is categorically expressed in the title to § 14, "The Massoretic Text—its essentially secondary character". This strong statement is somewhat tempered in the subsequent text, e. g.: "in scores or rather hundreds of passages it is wholly untrustworthy"; "to be more definite, we are obliged to maintain that it is often inferior to the LXX, Th., Pesh., and Vulg."; again, p. 1: "the reader cannot escape drawing the inference that the NT. is to a great extent untrustworthy, and needs to be corrected by these versions". The present writer in the course of preparation of his *Commentary on Daniel* came to quite the opposite conviction and reached the conclusion that in the most difficult portions of text the versions read what we now possess despite their apparent discrepancy. He had occasion to analyze and criticize Charles's critical positions as set forth in his small *Commentary* in the New Century Bible, and he found himself rarely able to accept its emendations as based on the versions. The distinguished scholar revealed there, as in his later book, a special penchant for the text of LXX or Old Greek, and he appears to have maintained his attitude unchanged in his large *Commentary*. The contrast with my position and results will be at once evident upon comparing my special Notes on the Old Greek appended to the several chapters where the problem looms large. Perhaps it is well that two practically contemporaneous commentaries take such opposite extremes, so that the absurdities of either may be revealed and others helped to a more rational mean. Charles makes his position clear to the eye in the display of contrasted texts in the translations of cc. 4 and 5, in the latter case after the approved form of parallel columns, and again in the commentary to the latter chapter, where, pp. 119-125, he finds a third columnar parallel in Josephus, for according to the commentator Josephus in part used an earlier and

better text than our present LXX MS. In all such cases the critical result is obtained by making selections from the different sources according to subjective taste. To cite one small detail for instance: at Dan. 5:10 objection is made to "the queen-mother's coming into the banquet chamber by reason of the words of the king and his lords", and preference is given to the LXX, "he called for her", along with citation of "another version" in Josephus (in what sense *version*?), who represents the grand dame as a guest at the rowdy banquet. As for the treatment of 8:11-13, "one of the most difficult passages in the book", pp. 204 ff., 377, I can but contrast my own, according to which the help of LXX is almost negligible. As to details of words and phrases that version is often of value, but it is to be used with greatest caution. Yet Charles prefers the corrupt datum of Αβιεσδρι to המלצר 1:11.16, although he admits that neither is explainable; he accepts the "howler" παρδειγματισθησθε at 2:5 as a better witness to the original than the Aramaic, and at v. 23 the sophisticated φρόνησις for גבורתא . He postulates a number of dislocations, listed p. lxiv, e. g. 1:20.21 as belonging after 2:49a (attractive but hardly necessary); the proclamation introducing c. 4 to be placed at its end on basis of LXX—the most bungled chapter in that version. A list of interpolations is given on p. lxv; if they are approved, the array is not formidable. It may be asked, without malice, whether, if the Biblical text is to be condemned as inferior on the ground of such blemishes, what is to be said of the immense quantum of dislocations, interpolations, and omissions in LXX?—n. b. cc. 4.5. The verse 3:23 is omitted for one reason because the Grr. omit it, but at this point begins their great apocryphal interpolation; for another reason, because the verb "they fell down" is repetitious after "they were cast into the furnace", v. 21, but the verb here means "were fallen", as it is used in Syriac.

Dr. Charles controverts me (p. 353, note, cf. also Bauer-Leander, § 87, f) on one point of theological interest, which may seem precarious enough, namely that Aram. אלהין is used at times just as Heb. אלהים in sense of God or rather the abstract Deity. Now בר אלהין 3:25, means not "a son of the gods" but "a son of Deity", i. e. "a divinity", just as Heb. איש אלהים means "a divine man", "a divine". I cannot think that when Pharaoh is made to say that Joseph has רוח אלהים , Gen. 41:38, or when Belshazzar attributes the same gift to Daniel, 4:4, we are to

translate "the spirit of the gods", or in the second passage, "the spirit of the holy gods" (for the monotheistic phrase with plural adjective cf. Josh. 24: 19). Nor do I mean that there is intrusion of Jewish theology into the Pagan speaker's mouth, for the religious coloring is remarkably true to form throughout Daniel. But in support of the claim that אֱלֹהִים could mean "Deity" in Aramaic like its Hebrew equivalent, there exists not only the parallel use of *ilāni* in Akkadian but also a fact which has not been observed, that 'ēlôh, 'ēlôhîm is not Hebraic but Aramaic, vs. the more primitive and Canaanite 'el. The Phoenicians had two plurals to this word by way of differentiation, 'elîm in sense of Deity, and 'elônîm, "gods". That is, the Hebrews drew their monotheistic term from the Aramaic, either by inheritance or by borrowing. Note also that עֲלִיּוֹנִין, "the highest", Dan. 7: 18 (it matters not if the passage be of Hebrew or Aramaic original) is a plural without Hebrew counterpart, i. e. just as אֱלֹהִים is used according to my contention.

These Auseinandersetzungen with Dr. Charles's book were made with more zest if the distinguished author were still in this life, but they may be taken as proof of its rich and stimulating value and permanent worth. It is our loss that we may expect nothing more from his illustrious mind.

Ibn Khaldun, Historian, Sociologist and Philosopher. By NATHANIEL SCHMIDT. New York: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1930. Pp. 67.

Abū l-Mahāsīn ibn Taghrī Birdī's Annals entitled an-nujūm az-zāhira fī mulūk Miṣr wal-Kāhira. Edited by WILLIAM POPPER. University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, Vol. 7: No. 1, 1926; No. 2, 1928; Nos. 3, 4, 1929. Berkeley: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS, 1926. Pp. lxi + 967.

Extracts from Abū l-Mahāsīn ibn Taghrī Birdī's Chronicle entitled ḥawādith ad-duḥūr fī madā l-ayyām wash-shuhūr. Edited by WILLIAM POPPER. University of California Publications in Semitic Philology, Vol. 8, No. 1, 1930; No. 2, 1931. Berkeley: UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS. Pp. ii + 394.

Kitāb al-'itibār li-'Usāmah ibn Munqidh. By PHILIP HITT.

Princeton: PRINCETON UNIVERSITY PRESS, 1930. Pp. xlii + 240.

Ta'riḥ Najd al-ḥadīṭ wa-mulḥakāṭihi . . . wa-sīrat 'Abd l-'Azīz ibn 'Abd-Raḥmān Faisal 'āl Sa'ūd malik al-Hijāz wa-Najd wa-mulḥakāṭiha. By AMIN RIḤANI. Beirut: PRESS OF JOSEPH SADIR, 1928. Pp. x + 436.

In quantity Arabic studies are at a minimum in this country. We have no Muslim colonials except the barbarous Philippine Moros; our trade with the Levant can be transacted through Western tongues; our great American schools in those regions are reflecting to us but little of the native culture and language. Only in the line of Judæo-Arabic studies is there any concrete advance, and there our Jewish scholars are proceeding with effect and brilliance.

Dr. Schmidt's *Ibn Khaldun* is a brief but imposing essay upon one of the greatest of Arab philosophical thinkers. It is in the first place a handbook of the manuscripts and editions of Ibn Khaldun, and then an appreciation of the man along with abundant citation and criticism of previous students, in the listing of whom Dr. Schmidt exhibits his characteristic erudition. The subject is successively pictured as Historian, Philosopher of History, and Sociologist. May this prolegomena be stimulus to other American scholars for further exploration in the field of Arabic literature. It may be noted that there still remains unpublished a supplement to Ibn Khaldun's Autobiography, which has recently come to light (pp. 38 ff.).

We have to mark the rapidly continued publication in sumptuous form by the University of California of Dr. Popper's laborious edition of Ibn Taghri Birdi's History of Egypt from the Muslim conquest to the middle of the 15th century. With the completion of vol. 7 we have the final part of the *Nujūm*. Of the six volumes to be devoted to it, according to the plan of the author, he has now completed three and one part of a fourth, the volumes still outstanding being those numbered 4 and 5. The editor is allowing this lacuna to remain for the present in order to apply himself to the publication of extracts from the historian's more comprehensive work, of which the *Nujūm* is an abridgement, namely the *ḥawādīṭ ad-duḥūr*, covering the period A. H. 845 seq.; this material the editor regards as of greater interest than that in the unpub-

lished volumes of the other work. The extracts are such as supplement the matter in the *Nujūm*. For the author's reasons and his comparison of the two works see his prefatory Note to vol. 7, no. 4. The same Note gives an interesting appreciation of the author as man and historian. Part 4 of vol. 7 contains, following the method of the earlier volumes, the Indexes of persons, places, etc., and the scholarly Glossary of unusual words and phrases. This work is the most extensive thing of the kind that has been undertaken by an American Arabist, and it appears to have been carried out in perfect form. To the editor's statement that "there would be a certain personal satisfaction in attempting to round out what may prove to be a lifetime's task by proceeding to these volumes of the *Nujūm* next," all scholars will add the expression of their hope that he will give them as well as himself that satisfaction.

The native soil of Arabic-speaking peoples is also now contributing its quota of scholars and literati to our American culture. They have become citizens as well as made their homes with us—we may think of Dr. Rihbany of Boston, but they retain their pride in the language and civilization from which they sprang. One of these scholars is Dr. Hitti, who holds the professorship of Ancient History at Princeton, but whose prime interest in Arabic studies is heartily abetted by his University, which has generously met the expense of preparing and publishing the Arabic text now to be noticed. Hitti's translation of this text appeared in 1929 under the title, *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman and Warrior in the Period of the Crusades. Memoirs of Usamah ibn Munqidh* (Columbia University Press). It was reviewed by the present writer in this JOURNAL in vol. 50, p. 261, and he gave it high praise for its English form and for the apparatus of introduction and notes, all which presented for the first time in our language one of the most delightful of Mediaeval documents and second to none as a narrative of exciting personal experiences. The text which has now appeared is a requisite for accurate criticism of the translation. As is well known, the first editor of Usamah was Hartwig Derenbourg, who between 1886 and 1895 provided a corpus of three volumes on the subject: the Arabic text, a French translation, and a volume of 730 pages giving a historical study of the life of the author. A German translation by G. Schumann appeared in 1905, which Hitti criticizes on p. 21 of his translation as "follow-

ing almost slavishly the French translation, rather than the Arabic original, and sharing its weaknesses." And between Hitti's two volumes has appeared an English translation by G. R. Potter, *Autobiography of Ousama ibn-Mounkidh*, which Hitti similarly criticizes as "without scientific value and with nothing new in it" (in his Arabic Preface, p. 41). The new editor in his treatment of the text has operated with entire independence, his University having procured for him photostatic copies of the unique manuscript in the Escorial. A glance at the facsimiles given by him and Derenbourg exhibits at once the difficulty of deciphering the carelessly written document; both Derenbourg's and Hitti's notes constantly illustrate this, and the latter in the prefaces to the two volumes, more at length in the Arabic volume, lists the various classes of difficulty. We may also remark the long list of corrections and additions to his text which Derenbourg was obliged to give in his large volume, pp. 607-637, a proof of that distinguished scholar's sense of the obstacles confronting him in decipherment. It is fortunate therefore that a fresh hand has undertaken a new edition of the text along with its translation, and fortunate too that the editor is Syrian born, acquainted not only with the classical but also with the vernacular Arabic—which he constantly depends upon for his interpretation, while the local detail is often specified by him as one thoroughly acquainted with the country.

There is no place for a grudging comparison between the two editors in text and translation. All honor remains with Derenbourg as editor princeps for this laborious and massive work. And Hitti constantly depends upon his readings and comments. But a second editor can in any particular case add to the results of his predecessor, still more so in so difficult a text as this is. The solution of an unpointed Arabic word may be guesswork in the first place, and the successor has the advantage of his predecessor in making another and perhaps better guess. The reviewer has in past years read Usamah through more than once, in part with his students, and has had occasion to realize not only the difficulty of Derenbourg's text but also the frequent inadequacy of his translation, which often appears—it is no unkind comment—to be paraphrase by way of cutting a Gordian knot, often without the expected note on the uncertainty of the text. It is difficult to document this criticism in extenso. Derenbourg's text and translation are most unfortunately not cross-paginated, so that it is a labor to refer

from one to the other, while to make further comparison with Hitti's text and translation were arduous indeed. It had been well if Hitti had cross-paginated with Derenbourg for the reader's ease of comparison. He fortunately gives this convenience as between his text and translation, but it is to be noted that, somewhat awkwardly at first sight, in the Arabic the folio number of the manuscript is given, in the translation the page number, e. g. text "10a" = translation "21". I give two examples of Hitti's correction of his predecessor. On p. 36 of Hitti's text, note 2, corrects the reading *mā ngb* to *mā tgb*, translating "continued without respite", which root and sense justify; Derenbourg, p. 35, translates "qu'on boit à petites gorgées", after the root meaning to "swallow", but that is certainly a venturesome translation. On p. 37 of his text Hitti notes, n. 3, an unpointed word which he corrects to *jaiš*, which suits the context; Derenbourg, p. 27, tr., p. 37, points the vocable as *hbs*, but then translates *fi habs* (properly "in prison") by "one of the generals"—it is difficult to see how he effected this tour de force. In his notes Hitti constantly opposes his readings to Derenbourg's, and the scholar can satisfy himself there in the debates between different interpretations. It may be remarked that Hitti is more thorough in listing uncertain words and indicating his corrections, so that his apparatus appears to be a scholarly basis for further study of the text and for correction of the new editor when this is required.

The Arabic volume is complete in itself and does not require the complement of the translation. The Preface of the latter appears here, in part, e. g. as to philology, Usamah's idiom, etc., in fuller form. The descriptive notes all reappear, along with a full Index. The work is therefore of use to Arabic-speaking people and it is to be hoped that it will have wide vogue in their native lands as one of their masterpieces. And there is another use of the volume which can be strongly recommended. Every teacher of Arabic knows the difficulty of procuring enough texts to "go round" in his class, unless he confines himself to selections; Western texts are very expensive, it is inconvenient to procure the cheap editions of native presses. For example Derenbourg's volumes have gone up tremendously in price within a few years. The present text of Hitti's is immediately available in America for students and at a reasonable price, and the student can have the satisfaction of possessing for himself one of the Arabic classics. To refer to its mechanical

execution, the book has been printed in this country by the linotype process, a method of manufacture which should be of vast help to Arabic publication in our journals and learned works, as the process is cheap. So far as the reviewer has noticed, the present volume is accurately printed, an encomium that cannot be given to many Arabic prints in the West.

Ameen Rihani is another Syrian gentleman of American adoption, who in several books of great interest and delightful style has made himself known to English readers: *The Book of Khalil*, 1911; *Ibn Sa'oud of Arabia, His People and his Land*, 1928 (the same, I understand as the British print, *Maker of Modern Arabia*); *Arabian Peak and Desert* and *Around the Coasts of Arabia*, 1930, as also numerous articles in *Asia*. For the historian and the scholar, however, his most important works are in Arabic, and we may be glad that he has kept his best for his native tongue. The first of these has been noticed earlier by the present writer (this JOURNAL 47. 99), his *Mulūk al-'Arab*, which gives the story of his peripulus about Arabia in 1922, undertaken in behalf of a self-imposed mission to effect a better understanding among the rival states of the peninsula. His more recent book now under consideration is of historical character, giving in the first place a description of Nejd and a history of the rise of the Wahhábis and their dynasty, and then for its principal gist a biography of the present "King of the Hijáz and King of Nejd", commonly known in the West as Ibn Saúd. In content it thus pairs with Philby's most recent and most timely book *Arabia* (Modern World Series, 1930), which is almost wholly devoted to the history of the Nejd state, and is based largely on the author's personal experiences in Nejd, where he enjoyed long and close personal relations with Ibn Saúd, and in Arabia at large, as described in his *Heart of Arabia* and *Arabia of the Wahhabis*. In his *Arabia* Philby has made careful use of certain native Nejdian chronicles, as his Preface relates. And Rihani likewise has made similar use of the same and other native records along with a great store of oral information that came his way. The King himself was one of his chief authorities, and actually took pains to help him in the geography of Nejd and the rendering of the local nomenclature; and the present history was undertaken with the full cognizance of the sovereign and with his hearty encouragement, even to the extent of procuring for the writer rare volumes of history. And so properly the book is dedicated to his

Majesty. The work is of historical importance. It gives a full and exact chronology of events, of some of which the author was an eyewitness, for example during his stay in Jedda during a large part of its year-long siege in 1925 by Ibn Saúd, whither he had gone on another mission of peace. It is fully documented with official pronouncements, dispatches, telegrams, etc., and is enlivened by the oratio directa of many conversations, some over the telephone. The book sustains the reader's interest throughout with the description of the kaleidoscopic changes in modern Arabian history and of scenes picturesquely presented which vary all the way from the life of the primitive desert, as in the account of Ibn Saúd's great trek to Mecca (c. 44) accompanied by his readers and *râwis*, to the scenes of modern warfare about Jedda, in which figure armored cars and airplanes, "Fords" also as the most useful arm, along with trench-fighting and electrified mines—against all which modern contrivances the Wahhábis fought with success after the manner of David and Goliath. It is impossible here to note the varied points of interest. Exact information is presented on the *hujar* (those who *leave* all behind), Wahhábí colonies of the Ikhwan or Brothers, which Ibn Saúd with consummate statesmanship is planting throughout his state; see c. 28, and for an exact table of the colonies as to location and population, pp. 412-414. (Compare for a brief but trenchant description Philby, pp. 222-227.) At the end of the book, pp. 349-411, are given some eight documents of official character bearing upon internal and external affairs. The history is brought down to the selection of Ibn Saúd as King of the Hijáz after the ancient forms of giving allegiance on January 10, 1926 (according to Philby, p. 324, Jan. 8). There is a full Index of persons and places. The volume is illustrated with a map of Nejd (on too fine a scale unfortunately to make the minute Arabic type of local names legible), and twenty-nine cuts all of interest in presenting contemporary persons and events. It may be pertinent to the history of the remarkable development of this Arabian state despite its seeming religious intransigence to cite a passage from Philby (p. 350): "In July [1929] the King set out once more for Central Arabia with a caravan of over 200 motor-cars, having meanwhile set in train negotiations for the purchase of four aeroplanes in England and for the engagement of British pilots to fly them. These machines arrived on the Hasa coast

towards the end of the year, by which time the King had also made considerable progress with a scheme for a comprehensive chain of wireless stations to link up the various important centres of his far-flung dominions."

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.

University of Pennsylvania.

Religione dei Yezidi; Testi Religiosi dei Yezidi. By GIUSEPPE FURLANI. Bologna: 1930. 124 pp.

The fact that the Near East, the center of several great religions, is also the home of a group of alleged worshippers of the devil was bound to appeal to a number of modern observers as uncommonly fascinating. A less sophisticated age, which was no less aware of the paradox of the situation, saw numerous attempts at a wholesale extermination of the Yezidis, a name for the entire group that is less misleading than Devil Worshipers. At present one simply writes about them, and the accounts range from sheer nonsense to a judicious estimate of the available data. The picture that is thus set up before the reader is partly mystery, largely mystification, and inevitably also a bit of truth. Fortunately, the little volume of Furlani is topheavy with truth.

The well-known Italian Assyriologist and student of religions is entirely at home in the confusing literature on the subject. His account is characterized by clarity and common sense. We see how the peacock came to be the representative of the Yezidi Supreme Power under the influence of those sects that hold the peacock responsible for the tempting of Eve. Furlani vigorously opposes the theory that *Taus* (peacock) is a survival of Tamuz. This is primarily due to the fact that the author makes the Yezidi doctrines (and the related Mandeian elements) largely dependent upon Moslem sectaries, a theory that requires more convincing proof than Furlani has been able to adduce. The name *Yezidi* should be derived, according to the author, from the Avestan *yazada* and the Neo-Persian *ized*, which signifies a group of celestial beings worthy of adoration. The reviewer has heard the Yezidis repeatedly connect their name with the Persian city of *Yazd*, a view that appears to him at least as plausible as Furlani's.

There are several minor misstatements in the book. The Shei-

khan group, which guards the most important sanctuaries of the Yezidis, is centered north and not east of Mosul (p. 4). The inhabitants of Sinjar are supposed to know a little Arabic, while those of Sheikhan are said to be totally ignorant of that language (p. 13). The fact is that the linguistic situation is practically reversed. The Yezidis of Bashiqa and Bahzani (both villages are in the Sheikhan district) happen to speak Arabic only, even among themselves. Kurdish is reserved for ritual purposes.

Furlani's translation of Yezidi texts follows the Arabic version. This is a pity since anyone who has compared this recension with the Kurdish original knows that the Arabic translation is often paraphrastic.

The main difficulty in studying the Yezidi religion is the unreliability of the Yezidi traditions. A simple and ignorant people with whom reading and writing are taboo cannot be expected to keep fact and fiction apart for many centuries. As one visitor expressed it a short time ago, "These Yezidis certainly believe in something, but they have forgotten what it is."

University of Pennsylvania.

E. A. SPEISER.

The Educational System of the Ancient Hindus. By SANTOSH KUMAR DAS, M. A. Calcutta: 1930. Pp. xii+508. ✓

This bulky quarto of five hundred pages by the Professor of History and Economics at Tri-Candra College, Nepal, deserves special mention because it attempts to cover a field as yet only partly surveyed. The author has given a good account of primary and secondary education, as it developed in the Vedic schools and Buddhistic monasteries, of the method and objects of study, and of the technical vocational training for caste-occupations (including that of princes), as well as a special chapter on female education in ancient India, with an adequate history of the various seats of learning, etc. As a general treatise this work can be recommended, but it is marred by quite inadequate exactitude in the translation not only of Vedic verses, but even of later Sanskrit sentences. When one has accustomed oneself to the peculiar transliteration (though it is not strange that an Indian scholar is irked by any such device) one finds that the translation is often even more

peculiar and that the reference given is misleading. How RV 3. 55. 16, which ends, in the author's transcription with *mmahāddebānāmsurtwamekam* can be translated "An unmarried young learned daughter should be married to a learned bridegroom. Never think of giving in marriage a daughter of very young age", is almost as puzzling as how "The women should read me (Veda)" renders the text printed here as *yachchāmnāyo bidagdhyāt*, which means (read *vidadhyāt*) "and as the holy text may determine," Gobh. GS. 1. 6. 12. In short, Professor Das is not at his best in the Veda or even in the Sūtras; but he has given an excellent general account, which errors in translation here and there do not materially affect. Those cited (from pages 223 and 226) pertain to the Vedic period, where much regarding woman's state is guess-work. What Professor Das is intent on showing is that in very early times women were acquainted with and used the (later forbidden) Vedic texts and though his translation is erratic his judgment is sound, for he has enough other texts (translated correctly) to prove his point. The chapter on female education is full of interesting matter, which should appeal to others than Sanskritists.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

Yale University.

The Aryanization of India. By NRIPENDRA KUMAR DUTT. Calcutta, Published by the Author.

"The purpose of this book is to present within a short compass a chronological and geographical framework for the political history of India for the Vedic and Epic periods, together with an intelligible account of the Aryan conquests so far as it can be made out of the confused mass of literature published on the subject." Few who have attempted this task have been as successful as the author. He regrets the absence of material from the Dravidian side, and also the paucity of archaeological evidence. He recognizes three strands of culture in India; Pre-Dravidian, Dravidian, and Aryan. The Dravidians reduced the earlier inhabitants to accept their culture; the Aryans conquered the Dravidians and the cultures of the two races were blended. In the last paragraph in the book he says that he believes that Hinduism owes much to Dravidian influences, and that it is difficult to say whether in its

modern form it is more Dravidian than Aryan. Some of the prevailing cults betray strong Dravidian characteristics. But the Vedic institutions are Aryan in the main foundation, gradually absorbing Dravidian ideas and practices. It is likely that the original Aryan element has been largely buried under a non-Aryan superstructure, to produce modern Hinduism.

“Aryanization,” then, can hardly mean exactly what the word seems to imply; his book rather deals with the advance of Aryan, or at least Aryan speaking tribes into India. It is obvious that if the pre-Aryan culture had sufficient vitality to consign the Vedic religion and its gods to virtual oblivion, to make the worship of non-Vedic deities universal, to change the ideas and philosophy of the peoples most radically, and further, (what he does not state), to retain the essential Dravidian form of the vernaculars, while accepting an overwhelming Aryan vocabulary, the “Aryanization” must have been very superficial and incomplete; the process of amalgamation could be equally well described as the “Indianization of the Aryans.”

The author has arranged his materials well. He has worked out of the scattered mass a reasonably consistent scheme of advance of Aryan tribes. He has not been led into the orthodox Indian conception that the Vedic Aryans have always been living in India, and that during the millions of years they have been there they civilized the rest of the world. Nor has he accepted the view that the Purāṇas are older and more reliable as sources of history than the Vedas. Both these views are well discussed in appendices.

In common with most Indians, the author pushes back the dates usually assigned to early Sanskrit literary monuments. The Aryans began to enter India 2300-2200 B. C.; the Rig Veda was composed between 2000 and 1400 B. C.; the Brāhmaṇa period followed immediately; the Upanishads date from 1000-800 B. C.; the Sūtras from 800 on; Panini was 500 B. C. These dates are arrived at by Max Mueller’s system of dead reckoning—allowing so many years for development and linguistic change between any two successive stages of literature. But in this book longer intervals are allowed than Max Mueller’s minima. Since no definite criteria are at hand, this method has to be tolerated. But the method does not take account of original dialectic differences, nor of the fact that the different types of literature were generally produced in different parts of India. This very much decreases the value of this method.

The fact that the language of the Rig Veda and that of the older Avesta seem to belong to the same period is referred to. But scholars are generally inclined to place the Avesta later than Professor Dutt places the Veda; he therefore does not attach much importance to this synchronization.

Professor Dutt seeks to corroborate these dates by an appeal to the history of Western Asia. The Kassites were an Aryan people who conquered Babylon in the twentieth century B. C.; they use the Aryan words *Šurīyaš* (*Sūrya*) and *Maruttaš* (*Marut*). Further, the Mitanni, who were an important power of the fourteenth century, were Aryans and worshipped Aryan gods. About this time Aryans were in the saddle throughout all Western Asia, and their bands invaded Palestine. This was the period when they were in power in Western India. So the author; but in reality the history of this region does not corroborate his views. *Šurīyaš* may indeed be connected with *sūrya*, but the ultimate derivation of the word is not clear. Kassite at times prefixed the element *šu* to divine names; this may be the case here; the proper name of the god would then be *Ria*. It can not be said positively that the Kassites had a god *Ria*, but their neighbors the Elamites did, and this name was also used farther to the west for the sun god. It is not certain, therefore, that Kassite *Šurīyaš* is identical with *Sūrya*. It can hardly be doubted that *Maruttaš* and *Marut* are the same word. But *Maruttaš* would seem to be the same as some of the Akkadian gods and may conceivably be identical with Marduk. Moreover, the Kassite language was not Indo-European. Neither was the Mitanni language Indo-European. A few proper names survive, which do have an Iranian look to them, but here it is possible that we are dealing with Asianic roots, rather than with Indo-European. Again, the names of the gods, Indra, and others, are not certainly European, and may have been borrowed in Asia by the advancing Aryans.

The book is a most useful summary of the material we have on the subject. It is sanely written and contains nothing extravagant.

An Account of the Tamil Academies. By T. G. ARAVAMUTHAN, M. A., B. L. Madras Law Journal, Mylapore. Madras: MADRAS LAW JOURNAL. n. d.

Recent years have witnessed increased critical interest in South Indian culture on the part of South Indian scholars. The pam-

phlet named must be included among the works of these authors. It constitutes a sort of advance chapter on a work which the author is preparing on the legendary Tamil Academies. He points out that the most interesting account of these Academies (according to some it is also the earliest account) is to be found in a commentary on a "Grammar" now known as *Iraiyanār('s) Ahap-Porul*. He gives his *verbatim* translation of this passage, and then proceeds to criticize it. The immediate problem is the date of this source. In the main his conclusions agree with those of such recent authors as P. T. Srinivas Iyengar and others. He places the *Ahap-Porul* itself in about the fourth or fifth century A. D., and the commentary in about the beginning of the eighth century. The section dealing with the Academies may be a later interpolation. Since the Academies are said to have had a combined length of 9,990 years, it can readily be seen that the historical value of the legend about them is not very great. We shall await with interest the author's completed work.

GEORGE WILLIAM BROWN.

Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford.

Outlines of Tibeto-Burman Linguistic Morphology. By STUART N. WOLFENDEN. (Volume XII of the Prize Publication Fund.) London: THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY, 1929. xv + 216 pages.

Mr. Wolfenden's study compares classical Tibetan with the languages of the Kachin, Bodo, Nâgâ, Kuki-Chin, and Burma groups, with special reference to the prefixes, infixes, and suffixes. Other dialects of Tibetan than the classical written language, for example, that of Khams, are not considered. Chinese, Tangut, Mon-Khmer, and other related languages are occasionally mentioned, but no study of them is made. Wolfenden continues the work in this field of Conrady, Laufer, and other scholars, with whom he sometimes differs. He offers a new interpretation of the prefix in Tibetan. By means of the "younger" languages of Assam and Burma, he endeavors to reconstruct the morphology of ancient Tibetan before it was reduced to writing in the seventh century of our era. In such an attempt there will always be room for differences of

opinion, and the reviewer is not qualified to make a critical judgment. But it is clear that the author has produced a very valuable and very interesting study.

Progress of Chinese Studies in the United States of America.

Edited by KENNETH S. LATOURETTE. Bulletin No. 1 of the Committee on the Promotion of Chinese Studies. Washington: AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, 1931. 102 pages.

This valuable survey includes articles on the progress of Chinese Studies in American universities, on Chinese art in public collections in the United States and Canada, on collections of Chinese books in America, reports of committees and conferences on the Far East, and lists of organizations and scholars interested or engaged in Chinese studies. The bulletin is supplementary to *China and Japan in Our University Curricula*, published in 1929 by the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations. The effectiveness of the campaign to promote Chinese studies and the generally increased interest in China are shown by a net gain of 51 courses dealing with China since the publication of the earlier report.

The conditions shown by the bulletin are encouraging, but far from satisfactory. Most of the courses listed in the curricula of American universities are introductory and superficial. There appear to be not more than 25 graduate students primarily concerned with China in the entire country. Nor are there many academic positions open to men who have majored in Chinese. Among the faculties and those who might join faculties there are two main classes: first, thoroughly trained scholars who do not know the Chinese language and who have not the background which only a long residence in China can give; second, those who, like the returned missionaries, have the background and the knowledge of the language, but who are not trained in critical scholarship. Lastly, there is a lack of reliable books on China in English. It is a serious question how valuable superficial courses on China, based on textbooks which abound in errors and taught by men who cannot speak or read a sentence of Chinese, will be in the development of American scholarship in this field.

In spite of these drawbacks, there are encouraging signs. American universities are awakening to the fact that there are vast and important fields which they have neglected. Students are showing increased interest. Libraries and collections of art are steadily growing. And there is a small but increasing number of men who are trained scholars capable of approaching a subject in a scientific manner, and have a knowledge of the language and the people which enables them to make real contributions to sinology. At present there is not a single native American who would be considered a first class authority in sinology by European scholars. There is no one who would rank with Pelliot, Laufer, Maspero, Cordier, Franke, Karlgren, or Duyvendak—to mention only a few names. But there is every indication that ten years from now there will be such men, and that there will soon be what will deserve the name of an American school of sinology.

J. K. SHRYOCK.

University of Pennsylvania.

The Currency of the Far East. The Schjöth Collection at The Numismatic Cabinet of the University of Oslo, Norway. By FR. SCHJÖTH. London and Oslo: LUZAC & Co., 1929. iv + 88 pages, and 132 plates.

This catalogue of 2,200 coins of the Far East was fortunately written by one who not only knew the series of coins he was describing but also, by having collected them, knew the actual coins themselves. It is refreshing to peruse a book on Chinese coins that is not full of misinformation handed down from most of the older Chinese numismatic writings, which were prone to ascribe the dates of the older coins to a period of great antiquity. Today it is considered doubtful if any of the Chinese coins can be dated before the eighth century B. C. In other words, the beginnings of Far Eastern and Greek coinages took place at about the same time. The author has endeavored to put as much muscle and sinew around a bare descriptive skeleton as possible, by putting a slight historical background about the various coins where needed and has interposed the Chinese characters with their transliteration and translation as well as explanation. Mr. Schjöth is to be congratulated

for the pains he has taken in making his descriptions clear, and not assuming that the reader was a Sinologue and knew as much of the subject as he did.

The collection as a whole is a well rounded representative collection, though weak in the earlier odd-shaped coins, as many forms and types are lacking. The pieces described and illustrated are nevertheless sufficient to render the volume an adequate text-book, and fulfill all requirements for most collectors of Chinese coins. The sections devoted to Chinese Charms are especially valuable.

The coins of Japan, Korea, and Annan are included as they are part of the collection, but they are hardly extensive enough to be of the same value to the student as is the Chinese section. A new departure in Chinese numismatics has been introduced in the volume, i. e., the weights of all the coins have been given. As the author mentions, the illustrations are not on the same level with the text, although they are as good as most books dealing with this subject.

HOWLAND WOOD.

American Numismatic Society, New York.

NOTES OF THE SOCIETY

The following members of the Society were appointed by the President as its official representatives at the Eighteenth International Congress of Orientalists held at Leiden on September 7 to 12, 1931: Professors Albright, Breasted, F. Edgerton, Gottheil, E. W. Hopkins, A. V. W. Jackson, M. L. Margolis, Olmstead, Reich, Speiser, and Zeitlin.

As delegates to the Second International Congress of Linguists held at Geneva on August 25 to 29, 1931, were appointed Professors F. Edgerton, M. L. Margolis, and Sellers.

NOTES OF OTHER SOCIETIES

The Linguistic Society of India has begun the publication of a journal *Indian Linguistics*, of which the first number has already appeared. Subscriptions (Rs. 12 per annum) should be sent to The Honorary Secretary, Linguistic Society of India, Lahore, India.

The New Orient Society of Chicago was inaugurated April 19, 1930, and is affiliated with, but distinct from, The New Orient Society of America. The main purpose of the organization is to establish practical means for cultural correspondence between the East and the West. The Open Court Publishing Company has agreed to publish for the Society twelve special numbers of its monthly magazine, with the coöperation of a special publication committee, dealing with the cultural development of the modern Orient. The officers of the Society are: Honorary President, Professor James H. Breasted; Honorary Vice-President, Dr. Berthold Laufer; Vice-Presidents, Mary Hegeler Carus, Professors F. C. Eiselen, Leslie E. Fuller, Albert H. Lybyer, A. T. Olmstead, Ovid R. Sellers, John Shapley, Martin Sprengling, Mr. Potter Palmer; Chairman Executive Committee, Mr. Henry Field; Secretary-Treasurer, Catherine Cook. Those who are desirous of becoming members of the New Orient Society of Chicago are invited to apply for particulars of purposes and privileges of membership to the Secretary, 337 E. Chicago Ave., Chicago, Ill.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
American Oriental Society

AT THE MEETING IN PRINCETON, 1931

The sessions of the One Hundred and Forty-third Meeting of the Society were held in Princeton, N. J., at the University, on Tuesday and Wednesday, April 7th and 8th, 1931, in conjunction with the Conference on Far Eastern Studies. All the sessions were held in McCosh Hall. The following members were present at one or more sessions:

Albright	Fenn	Mott
Archer	Gale	Obermann
Bailey	Gardner	Ogden, C. J.
Barret	Gehman	Olmstead
Barton	Gordon, C. H.	Parry, Miss
Bates, Mrs.	Gottheil	Pratt
Bender	Graves	Prentice
Briggs, G. W.	Hamilton	Regner
Brown, G. W.	Hardy	Reich
Brown, W. N.	Hitti	Ridgley
Bull	Hodous	Rowell, Miss
Cadbury	Hopkins, E. W.	Rudolph, Miss
Chandler	Hummel	Sanders, F. K.
Chapman	Hussey, Miss	Schanzlin
Clark	Jackson, A. V. W.	Schapiro
Collitz	Jackson, Mrs.	Schmidt, N.
Creighton	Kent	Seiple
DeLong	Kraeling, C. H.	Shryock
DeWitt, Mrs.	Latourette	Sturtevant
Donohugh, Mrs.	Laufer	Taylor, W. R.
Dougherty	Luce	Torrey
Dumont	Marcus	Uhl
Duncan	Margolis, M. L.	von der Osten
Edgerton, F.	Montgomery	Wright, W. L.
Enslin	Morgenstern	Zwemer

Total 75

There were also present some of those attending the Conference on Far Eastern Studies, including Messrs. Ryusaku Tsunoda and

Olin D. Wanamaker who read papers at the joint session of the Society with the Conference.

Present as guests of the Society were Professor J. J. L. Duyvendak of the University of Leiden, and Mrs. Duyvendak.

THE FIRST SESSION

At 11.10 A. M. on Tuesday, the first session of the meeting was called to order by President Berthold Laufer. Reading of the minutes of the meeting in Toronto in 1930 was dispensed with as they were already in print (*JOURNAL* 50. 308-341). There were no corrections and the minutes were approved.

Professor Hitti of Princeton, Chairman of the Committee on Arrangements, presented his Committee's report in the form of a printed program. The succeeding sessions were announced to be on Tuesday afternoon at 2.30 P. M., on Wednesday morning at 9.30 A. M., and on Wednesday afternoon at 2.30 P. M. It was announced that the members were invited to an informal reception on Tuesday evening at the Princeton Theological Seminary. It was also announced that the members were invited to luncheon in the University dining hall on Wednesday. It was further announced that the annual subscription dinner would be held in Procter Hall of the Graduate College on Wednesday evening.

President Laufer read a letter from Professor Breasted of the University of Chicago, inviting the Society to meet in Chicago in 1932. He then retired from the session temporarily in order to take part in the Conference on Far Eastern Studies and Vice-President Olmstead took the chair.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY

The Corresponding Secretary, Dr. Charles J. Ogden, presented the following report:

The report upon the membership of the Society shows practically no change from last year: forty persons were elected to membership and one was reinstated, but fifteen were lost by death and twenty-eight resigned or failed to qualify. The total number on our roll at the present time is 775, of whom 748 are corporate members.

The Society has been officially represented at the following academic occasions: at the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Transylvania College, June 1 to 4, 1930, by Professor C. L. Pyatt; at the seventy-fifth anniversary of Garrett Biblical Institute, June 8 to 11, 1930, by Professor

A. T. Olmstead; and at the inauguration of President Robert Gordon Sproul of the University of California, on October 22, 1930, by Professor E. M. Gale. Of special interest was the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, which was held in connection with its annual meeting on December 29 and 30, 1930, and at which this Society was represented by Professors E. G. Kraeling, J. M. Powis Smith and C. C. Torrey. We have also been invited to send delegates to the Eighteenth International Congress of Orientalists to be held at Leiden in September next and to the Second International Congress of Linguists at Geneva in August, and it is expected that the selection of our representatives will soon be completed.

Your Corresponding Secretary attended as usual the Conference of Secretaries held on January 29, 1931, in connection with the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies, as also the sessions of the Council itself on the two following days. The subject most prominently brought before the Secretaries' Conference was the publication of books and monographs by learned societies, and the discussion was based on the survey made by Mr. John Marshall of the Medieval Academy of America, with especial reference to the question of distributing such publications more effectively. Other matters considered were the collection and preservation of materials for research, such as newspapers and other data of a fugitive character, and the reproduction of manuscripts for purposes of study.

There remains now the commemorative mention of those members who have died during the period since our last meeting, five of them being honorary members and ten corporate.

Dr. THEODOR NÖLDEKE, of Karlsruhe, professor at the University of Kiel from 1864 to 1872 and at the University of Strassburg from 1872 until his retirement in 1906, was universally recognized as the dean of Semitic scholars. His fame is perhaps most closely associated with his Arabic studies, but he was a master likewise in the domains of Syriac, Hebrew, and general Semitic philology, as well as in Middle and New Persian. A long series of published works, extending from his *Geschichte des Qorâns* (1860) to his *Untersuchungen zum Achigar-Roman* (1913), are monuments to his scholarship. He was elected an honorary member in 1878 and died on December 25, 1930, at the age of 94.

Dr. EDUARD SACHAU, professor emeritus of Oriental languages at the University of Berlin, where he had lectured from 1876 until 1920, after seven years' service at Vienna, was likewise primarily an Arabist and an Aramaic scholar, but was widely interested in the history and culture of the Near East, both ancient and modern. Indologists are also permanently indebted to him for his edition and translation of *Alberuni's India*. He was elected an honorary member in 1887 and died on September 17, 1930, at the age of 85.

Dr. EDUARD MEYER, professor emeritus of ancient history at the University of Berlin, with which he had been associated since 1902 after having

taught at other German universities, was best known through his monumental *Geschichte des Altertums*, begun in 1884 but under continual revision by him up to the time of his death. He also devoted a number of special works to Oriental subjects, notably to Egyptology and the history of Judaism and early Christianity. He was elected an honorary member in 1908 and died on August 31, 1930, at the age of 75.

Dr. ARTHUR ANTHONY MACDONELL, emeritus professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford, having retired in 1926 after serving the University since 1880, bore a name familiar to every English-speaking Indologist by reason of his *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* and his *History of Sanskrit Literature*, and was distinguished for his more specialized works on Vedic grammar, mythology, and realia. He was elected an honorary member in 1918 and died on December 28, 1930, at the age of 76.

Dr. HEINRICH ZIMMERN, professor of Oriental languages at the University of Leipzig since 1900, was trained for the work of the ministry but was led by his scholarly interests to engage in the study of Assyriology, to which he made many important contributions. He was also a Hebraist and for many years co-editor of the *Leipziger Semitistische Studien* and more recently editor of the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*. He was elected an honorary member in 1923 and died on February 17, 1931, at the age of 68.

Rev. Dr. ALEXANDER R. GORDON, a minister of the Scottish Free Church, came to Canada in 1907 and was for twenty-three years professor of Old Testament literature in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Montreal and from 1914 onwards professor of Hebrew at McGill University. In the summer of 1930 he was called to the chair of Hebrew and Oriental languages at the University of St. Andrews. He was the author of many works on the Old Testament. Elected a corporate member in 1912, he died on March 5, 1931, at the age of 58.

Mr. ARTHUR J. WESTERMAYR, a lawyer of New York City, who was interested in art and travel as well, had written several books on Egyptian art and related subjects. He was elected a member in 1912 and died on December 27, 1930, at the age of 65.

Mr. JOHN REILLY, JR., of New York City, who was educated at Princeton University for engineering, became deeply interested in the numismatics of the Far East and assembled an unrivaled collection of Chinese coins and tokens as well as specimens from the neighboring countries. He was long an officer of the American Numismatic Society, and was also a frequent attendant at our own meetings, where his presence will be greatly missed by his associates. He was elected a member in 1918 and died on January 30, 1931, at the age of 54.

Rev. RALPH D. CORNUELLE, of the American Presbyterian Mission, Fatehgarh, India, a graduate of the University of Cincinnati and of the Princeton Theological Seminary, had lived in India since 1918, save for a year's stay at Columbia University. He was superintendent of a high

school and a director of Ewing Christian College at Allahabad. He was elected a member in 1922 and died on February 19, 1931, at the age of 48.

Dr. WILLIAM COWEN, of New York City, a specialist in diseases of the eye and ear, was for many years ophthalmologist of the Lebanon Hospital and was a Fellow of the American College of Surgeons. He was elected a member in 1922 and died on January 26, 1931, at the age of 71.

Sir RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE, Bart., C. I. E., born in India, had a long and distinguished military and administrative career in India and Burma, and as a scholar likewise wrote extensively upon the folklore and anthropology of those countries. Since 1884 he had been the chief editor of the *Indian Antiquary*. He was elected a member in 1928 and died in Switzerland on March 3, 1931, at the age of 80.

Mr. KARL KIRCHBERGER, of London, was actively in contact with the Orient as an East India merchant, having been associated for about twenty-five years with the firm of Katz Bros., Ltd., of London and Singapore. He was elected a member in 1928 and died in Paris on December 2, 1930, at the age of 67.

Mr. DAVID N. MOESSOHN, of New York City, editor of *The Jewish Tribune*, and chairman of the Associated Dress Industries of America, was notable for his ability as a lawyer, publisher, and executive, and belonged to many business and commercial organizations. He was elected a member in 1929 and died on December 16, 1930, at the age of 47.

Also the following, concerning whom the Secretary has not been able to learn any particulars: Mr. FLORIN JONES LENOX of New York, elected in 1918, and Rev. Dr. THOMAS STENHOUSE, vicar of Mickley, Stocksfield-on-Tyne, England, elected in 1921.

Upon motion the report of the Corresponding Secretary was accepted.

Tribute was paid to deceased members: to Professors Macdonell and Nöldeke by Professor Jackson; to Professor Sachau by Professor Zwemer; to Professors Sachau and Meyer by President Morgenstern; to Professor Zimmern by Professors Hussey and Albright; to Professor Meyer by Professor Olmstead.

On motion it was voted unanimously to send to Dr. Abbott and to Professors Lanman and MacDonald the good wishes of the Society and regrets that they were unable to be present at the meeting.

On motion it was voted unanimously to send to Professor Geiger of Munich, an honorary member of the Society, the greetings and good wishes of the Society on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday.

Vice-President Olmstead announced the appointment by President Laufer of Professors Clark, Barret and Edgerton as a Committee on Resolutions.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER

The Treasurer, Professor John C. Archer, made the following report:

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1930.

Receipts

Cash Balance, Jan. 1, 1930.....	\$9,822.27	
Dues from 580 members.....	3,548.55	
Sales: JOURNAL (gross) to Jan. 31, 1930.....	1,186.75	
Panchatantra (6 sets, net).....	35.38	
Tagalog Grammar (8 copies, net).....	26.97	
Nies Fund income.....	\$522.50	
By G. A. Barton.....	250.00	
Sales, net.....	21.62	
	<hr/>	794.12
Reprints from JOURNAL.....	39.75	
Authors' corrections.....	3.10	
Interest:		
Yale Univ.....	441.20	
Mortgage	345.00	
Virginia Ry.....	50.00	
Minn. Gen. Elec.....	50.00	
	<hr/>	886.20
C., R. I. & P. Ry:		
Dividend	120.00	
Sale, 20 rights.....	24.00	
	<hr/>	144.00
(Total income.....)	\$6,664.82)	
	<hr/>	\$16,487.09

Expenditures

JOURNAL:

J. H. Furst Co., printing.....	\$2,149.32	
Reprints	100.44	
Corrections	50.00	
	<hr/>	\$2,299.76
Yale Univ. Press:		
Returns, cancellations.....	54.60	
Commissions	283.04	
Transportation	167.73	
Mailing 3,800 copies.....	152.00	
	<hr/>	657.37

Book Reviews.....	68.00	
Barton volume, publication.....	3,008.06	
Type storage.....	33.38	
		<hr/> 3,041.44
Expenses: Indo-Iran. Com.....	11.20	
Jackson, cablegram.....	4.65	
Editors	27.50	
Librarian	15.00	
Treasurer	20.39	
Corresponding Secretary.....	226.67	
Clerical, Yale Univ.....	125.55	
Dues, A. C. L. S.....	25.00	
Subvention, Orient. Bib.....	50.00	
Honoraria: editors.....	600.00	
treasurer	100.00	
Refund (excess dues).....	1.00	
(Total expenditures.....	\$7,273.53)	
BALANCE, Dec. 31, 1930.....	9,213.56	
		<hr/> \$16,487.09
The SPECIAL FUNDS held by the Society are:		
Charles W. Bradley.....	\$3,000.00	
I. M. Casanowicz.....	150.00	
Alexander I. Cotheal.....	1,500.00	
Life Membership.....	3,775.00	
Nies Fund income balance, <i>interest, etc.</i>	2,021.23	
Panchatantra-Tagalog, <i>with interest</i>	789.37	
Publication, <i>with interest</i>	90.15	
William Dwight Whitney.....	1,000.00	
Reserve, approximately.....	2,000.00	
		<hr/> \$14,225.75
Jewett, <i>with interest</i>	1,675.63	

The ASSETS of the Society on Jan. 1, 1931 were:

Bonds: Virginia Ry.	\$1,000.00	
Minneapolis General Electric.....	1,000.00	
C. R. I. & P. Ry., 20 shares.....	2,000.00	
Mortgage	6,000.00	
Cash on deposit Yale Univ.....	9,213.56	
		<hr/> \$19,213.56

The NET CASH BALANCE in the General Fund is.. \$3,312.18

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE

The report of the Auditing Committee was then read by the Recording Secretary as follows:

We hereby certify that we have examined the accounts of the Treasurer of the Society and have found them correct and that the foregoing statements are in conformity therewith.

K. S. LATOURETTE,

R. P. DOUGHERTY,

Auditors.

Upon motion the reports of the Treasurer and the Auditing Committee were accepted.

Professor Archer reported for the Committee on Publications, stating that the catalogue of the Society's library had been printed and could be obtained from the Librarian.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN

In the absence of the Librarian, Professor Andrew Keogh, the Corresponding Secretary read his report as follows:

The number of volumes added to the Library during the year 1930-31 was 113. In addition to these books and pamphlets, there were received 283 numbers of periodicals continuing sets already in the Library or representing sets new to the Library. Following the transfer of books to the Sterling Memorial Library, inventory was taken and the shelves were read. The cataloguing of books, pamphlets, and periodicals is up to date.

Following is a list of accessions for the year:

- *Abd al-Muqtadir. Manuscripts of mixed contents. 1930. (Bankipore, Bengal. Oriental public library. Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian mss., v. 17).
- Achelis, H. Die Bischofchronik von Neapel (von Johannes Diaconus u. a.) 1930. (Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Klasse der Säch. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd. XL. Nr. IV)
- Aitken, R. T. Ethnology of Tubuai. 1930. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Bulletin 70) Bayard Dominick expedition. Publication no. 19.
- Bataviaasch genootschap van kunsten en wetenschappen. Feestbundel. Deel II. 1929.
- Bouge, L. J. Notes on Polynesian pounders. 1930. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Occasional papers, v. 10, no. 2)
- Caucutta. Imperial library. Catalogue. Pt. II. Subject-index to the author catalogue. 1st supplement. 1929.
- Ceylon. Archaeological dept. Catalogue of negatives in the archaeological department, Ceylon. June, 1930. 1930.

- Delafosse, M. La langue mandigue et ses dialectes (malinké, bambara, dioula). I. 1929. (Bibliothèque de l'École nationale des langues orientales vivantes, t. 10).
- Dhirananda, *Swami*. Glimpses of light. A collection of excerpts from sermons on Oriental and Occidental philosophies. [c 1929]
- Dumézil, G. Le problème des centaures. 1929. (Annales du Musée Guimet, t. 41)
- Easton, B. S. Christ in the Gospels. 1930. (The Hale lectures, 1929-30)
- Handy, E. S. C. Marquesan legends. 1930. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Bulletin 69) Bayard Dominick expedition. Publication no. 18.
- The Problem of Polynesian origins. 1930. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Occasional papers, v. 10, no. 8)
- Hertel, J. Beiträge zur Erklärung des Awestas und des Vedas. 1929. (Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Klasse der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Bd. XL., Nr. II)
- Herzfeld, E. Kushano-Sasanian coins. 1930. (Memoirs of the Archaeological survey of India, no. 38)
- Johnston, G. Ancient mysteries. [c 1930]
- Judd, H. P. Hawaiian proverbs and riddles. 1930. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Bulletin 77)
- Kroeber, A. L. Archaeological explorations in Peru. Pt. II. The Northern coast. 1930. (Field museum of natural history. Anthropology. Memoirs, vol. II, no. 2)
- Leidinger, G. Münchener Dichter des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts. 1930.
- Leigh, R. W. Dental morphology and pathology of prehistoric Guam. 1930. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Memoirs, vol. XI, no. 3)
- Longhurst, A. H. Pallava architecture. Pt. III. 1930. (Archaeological survey of India. Memoirs. no. 40)
- Macler, F. Trois conférences sur l'Arménie. 1929. (Annales du Musée Guimet, t. 49)
- Mogk, E. Der Ursprung der mittelalterlichen Sühnekreuze. 1929. (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Säch. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse. 81. Bd. 1929. 1. Heft.)
- Muinuddin Nadwi. Quranic science. Pt. I. 1930. (Bankipore, Bengal, Oriental public library. Catalogue of the Arabic and Persian mss., v. 18)
- Pappus, Alexandrinus. The commentary of Pappus on Book X of Euclid's elements. Arabic text and translation by William Thomson. 1930. (Harvard Semitic series, vol. 8)
- Renou, L. Grammaire sanscrite. 1930. 2v.
- Roberts, F. H. H. Early Pueblo ruins in the Piedra district, southwestern Colorado. 1930. (U. S. Bureau of American ethnology. Bulletin 96)
- Upaṇiṣads. Chāndogya-upaṇiṣad. Tr. et annotée par E. Senart. 1930. (Collection E. Senart)
- Shapiro, H. L. The physical characters of the Society Islanders. 1930. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Memoirs, vol. 11, no. 4)

- Sievers, E. Nachruf auf Victor Michels. 1929. (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Säch. Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse. 81. Band. 1929. 2. Heft)
- Neue Beiträge zur Lehre von der Kasusintonation. 1929. (Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Klasse der Säch. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Bd. XL, Nr. III)
- Stein, Sir A. An archaeological tour in Upper Swat and adjacent hill tracts. 1930. (Memoirs of the Archaeological survey of India, no. 42)
- Szpidbaum, H. O typach Żydów jasnowłosych w Polsce. 1929. (Archiwum nauk antropologicznych. Tom. III. Nr. 4)
- Tavadia, J. C., ed. Śāyast-nē-śāyast, a Pahlavi text on religious customs. 1930. (Alt- und Neu-Indische Studien, 3)
- Tuttle, E. H. Dravidian developments. 1930. (Language monographs, no. 5)
- Vance, W. René Fülöp-Miller's search for reality. [1929?]
- Whitcombe, J. D. Notes on Tongan ethnology. 1930. (Bernice P. Bishop museum. Occasional papers, vol. 10, no. 9.)

The printing of the catalogue of the library is finished, and a copy is submitted as part of this report. In the preface to the volume I have expressed the thanks of the Society to those who helped to make publication possible.

On motion the report of the Librarian was accepted.

REPORT OF THE EDITORS OF THE JOURNAL

The Senior Editor, Professor Max L. Margolis, presented the following report:

The editors beg to report that since the last meeting of the Society there have been issued Nos. 1-4 of Volume 50 and No. 1 of Volume 51. The editors record with pleasure the kindness of eminent members of the Society whose advice was sought and the uniform courtesy of the contributors rendering the editorial task less arduous than it might otherwise have been. It is also a source of gratification that the JOURNAL is indeed comprehensively Oriental, embracing all of the Orient, the Far as well as the Near East.

MAX L. MARGOLIS,
W. NORMAN BROWN,
Editors.

On motion the report of the Editors was accepted.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Corresponding Secretary presented the report of the Executive Committee as printed in the JOURNAL (51. 86).

Upon motion the actions of the Committee were ratified.

JOINT SESSION WITH THE CONFERENCE ON FAR EASTERN STUDIES

At 12.20 P. M., the members joined with those participating in the Conference on Far Eastern Studies, President Laufer taking the chair.

An address of welcome was made by President John Grier Hibben of Princeton University.

The reading of papers was then begun.

Mr. RYUSAKU TSUNODA, of the Japanese Culture Center in America: The Collection of the Japanese Culture Center.

Mr. OLIN D. WANAMAKER, of New York City: A New Cultural and Economic Foundation in China. Remarks by Professor Luce.

The session adjourned at 12.50 P. M.

THE SECOND SESSION

The second session was called to order at 2.50 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon.

President Laufer delivered an address on "Columbus and Cathay, and the meaning of America to the Orientalist" (printed in JOURNAL 51. 87-103).

ELECTION OF MEMBERS

The following persons recommended by the Directors were duly elected corporate members of the Society (the list includes one who was elected at a later session):

Dr. Florence Ayscough	Mr. George C. Miles
Mr. Woodbridge Bingham	Prof. Valentin K. Müller
Mr. Raymond A. Bowman	Mr. Charles F. Nims
Mr. Meyer S. Cohen	Dr. H. H. von der Osten
Dean Edgar J. Fisher	Dr. Eleanor Parry
Mr. Felix Freifelder	Mr. Horace I. Poleman
Mrs. John B. Gilfillan	Rev. Gale Ritz
Mr. Albert D. Glanville	Mr. Harold Rosen
Rev. Dr. Fred F. Goodsell	Miss Teresina Rowell
Mr. Zelig S. Harris	Dr. Frank Schechter
Dr. Paul W. Harrison	Miss Madeleine I. Séverac
Rev. Dr. George P. Hedley	Mr. Joseph M. Upton
Mr. N. M. Heeramaneck	Prof. Hans N. von Koerber
Prof. Clark Hopkins	Miss M. Rogers Warren
Prof. Morris U. Lively	Pres. George E. White
Rev. Allan A. MacRae	Prof. W. L. Wright, Jr.
Mr. Thomas E. Marston	

[Total 33]

The following persons recommended by the Directors were duly elected honorary members of the Society:

Professor CARL BROCKELMANN, late of the University of Breslau.

Professor F. LLEWELLYN GRIFFITH, of Oxford University.

Professor HEINRICH LÜDERS, of the University of Berlin.

Professor HENRI MASPÉRO, of the Collège de France.

Professor JACOB WACKERNAGEL, of the University of Basel.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Dr. Morgenstern presented the report of the Committee on the Nomination of Officers for 1931 as follows:

President: Professor NATHANIEL SCHMIDT, of Ithaca.

Vice-Presidents: Professor HAROLD H. BENDER, of Princeton; Professor ROMAIN BUTIN, of Washington; Professor ALBERT T. OLMSTEAD, of Chicago.

Corresponding Secretary: Dr. CHARLES J. OGDEN, of New York City.

Recording Secretary: Dr. LUDLOW BULL, of New York City.

Treasurer: Professor JOHN C. ARCHER, of New Haven.

Librarian: Professor ANDREW KEOGH, of New Haven.

Editors of the Journal: Professor MAX L. MARGOLIS, of Philadelphia; and Professor W. NORMAN BROWN, of Philadelphia.

Director to serve for one year, succeeding Professor SCHMIDT: Professor MICHAEL I. ROSTOVITZ, of New Haven.

Directors to serve for three years: Professor RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY, of New Haven; Dr. BERTHOLD LAUFER, of Chicago; and Professor THEOPHILE J. MEEK, of Toronto.

The officers thus nominated were duly elected.

The reading of papers was then begun.

Professor GEORGE S. DUNCAN, of the American University: The Antiquity of Egyptian Civilization. Remarks by Professor Barton and Dr. Uhl.

Recent Egyptian excavations have revealed, at 200,000 B. C., a stone age culture with tools and weapons having sharp edges. This very ancient culture was apparently the forerunner and source of that remarkable civilization which blossomed in the Nile valley between 5000 and 2000 B. C., and which produced a calendar of 12 months, the invention of writing, a great united nation, a remarkably lofty religious literature, unsurpassed building and engineering achievements, and an amazing excellence in sculpture and gold work. This culture probably early entered Mesopotamia and gave a great impulse to the civilization between the Tigris and Euphrates. Egypt should now be regarded as the cradle of civilization.

Professor NATHANIEL J. REICH, of the Dropsie College: Hitherto unknown Egyptian Documents from the Serapeum of Memphis in the New York Historical Society.

Professor RALPH MARCUS, of the Jewish Institute of Religion: Brief Notes on Hellenistic Jewish Literature. Remarks by Professor Duncan.

(1) Two alleged Semitisms in the Wisdom of Solomon: (a) *ἐλεγχθήσεται*, I. 5; (b) *παρὰ πτώματος ἰδίου*, X. 1. (2) Hans Lewy's projected edition of the Armenian translation of Philo. (3) The Josephus Lexicon.

Professor W. L. WRIGHT, JR., of Princeton University: Baqqāl-oghlu Şāri Mehmed Pashā and his 'Kitāb ūl-Güldeste.' Remarks by Professor Hitti.

A brief biography of the author, outlining the career of an Ottoman official who started as a simple clerk and rose to the rank of Defterdar or head of the Treasury Department, a position which he held on seven different occasions during the early part of the XVIII century. Ambition to become Grand Vizir led to his exile and eventual execution. His "Book of the Bouquet" or "Counsels for Vizirs and Rulers", which was intended as an ethical and political guide for high government officers, is then discussed, with particular reference to his criticism of Ottoman administration and suggestions for its reform.

Professor JULIAN J. OBERMANN, of the Jewish Institute of Religion: Notes on the al-Ḥiḍr Legend. Remarks by Professor Montgomery.

The problem of the literary origin of Sūra XVIII, 60-82, cannot be said to have found hitherto a satisfactory solution. Various parallels to this or that aspect of the legend, Babylonian and Greek as well as Jewish and Christian, have indeed been suggested. But they prove upon examination too meagre a source for the strikingly elaborate Qur'ānic revelation. The only parallel close and detailed enough to claim the value of direct literary affiliation is to be found in the recently discovered Arabic MS of Ibn Shāhīn's *Faraḡ* Book (hitherto known only by the medium of a late Hebrew paraphrase). Analysis of the stylistic and ideological relationship between Ibn Shāhīn's recension of the legend and that of Muhammed is the object of the present paper.

Dr. H. H. VON DER OSTEN, of the University of Chicago: The Test Excavation 1930 of Giaur Kalessi. Remarks by Professors Duncan and Sturtevant.

The session adjourned at 5.30 P. M.

THE THIRD SESSION

The third session began with separate Semitic and Indological sections, which were called to order at 9.30 o'clock Wednesday morning, and the reading of papers was immediately begun.

THE INDOLOGICAL SECTION

Professor Hopkins was elected chairman of the Indological section.

Rev. Dr. LEMON L. UHL, of Boston, Mass.: Colorado-Telingana Mss. of Portions of the Mahābhārata.

Externally:—How were manuscripts obtained? What are they? Internally:—Who was the copyist? When? Copied from what? Translation from which Sanskrit text? In purview:—Vyāsa's Sanskrit Bhārata,—Tikkana Somayāji's Telugucized production,—and Vangula Kāmakāzu's copied portions. Dates:—Vyāsa, 500 B. C.,—Somayāji, 1000 A. D.,—and Kāmakāzu, 1830 A. D. The Mss. contain Somayāji's productions from four cantos,—Kāmakāzu's summaries at front end of pages, and notes at chapter openings and closings. The survey reveals processes in transmission, translating and distribution of sacred writings,—and the magnitude of Sukthankar's attempt to come nearest the original Mahābhārata.

Professor FRANKLIN EDGERTON, of Yale University: The Sanskrit Pro-nominal 'Stems' in -*ā* (published in the 'Festschrift für Wilhelm Geiger'). Remarks by Dr. Ogden, Professors Sturtevant and Kent, and Mr. Raymond.

These stems (type *tad*), used in composition and derivation, have never been satisfactorily explained. It is held by the author that they are analogical extensions from the morphology of nouns and adjectives. In nearly all noun declensions, the stem used in composition and derivation is identical in form with the nominative-accusative singular of the neuter inflection (*vāri*, *madhu*, *nāma*, *bhavat*, *manas*, etc.). Hence the neuter nom.-acc. of generic pronouns (*tad*) was used as the stem in the same way. This usage was then extended to the personal pronouns (*mad*) by analogy with the generic pronouns (*tad*).

Professor HERMANN COLLITZ, of the Johns Hopkins University: The Avestan Prefix *aš-*. (Printed in JOURNAL 51. 160-163.)

Professor E. H. STURTEVANT, of Yale University: Changes of Quantity caused by Indo-Hittite *h*.

In Indo-Hittite long vowels and diphthongs with long prior element were shortened before *h*. In Pre-Indo-European *h* was lost in all positions, and an immediately preceding vowel was lengthened if *h* had been followed by another consonant. These phonetic laws furnish an explanation of certain vowel alternations in Greek and Sanskrit which have hitherto been ascribed with some difficulty to ablaut.

Rev. G. L. SCHANZLIN, of Baltimore, Md.: On the Structure of Munda Words. Remarks by Mr. Raymond, Professors Collitz, Edgerton and G. W. Brown, and Dr. Uhl.

An attempt to examine the degrees of relationship that exist between

the Munda languages of India and the Mon-Khmer languages of Indo-China with their congeners. Part One of the paper deals with the history of the Sanskrit word *Karpāsa*, cotton, tracing the use of cotton back to Southern Asia. The second part of the paper deals with the peculiar endings *om*, *am* and *um*, characteristic of both, the Munda as well as the Mon-Khmer, and other related languages.

Professor W. NORMAN BROWN, of the University of Pennsylvania: The Sources and Nature of *pūruṣa* in the Puruṣasūkta (Rigveda 10. 90). Remarks by Dr. Uhl and Professor Collitz. (Printed in JOURNAL 51. 108-118.)

Professor E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, of Yale University: Notes on Epic Fauna. Remarks by Professor G. W. Brown and Dr. Uhl.

Observation on the epic treatment of animal life. Was the lion or the tiger the more powerful, what birds were kept in cages, what about snakes' legs, how many animals were edible, and other unimportant but more or less interesting points.

Professor P. E. DUMONT, of the Johns Hopkins University: The Legend of Sītā in the Kūrmapurāṇa.

THE SEMITIC SECTION

Vice-President Olmstead took the chair in the Semitic section.

Dr. CYRUS H. GORDON, of the University of Pennsylvania: The Aramaic Incantation Bowls in the University of Pennsylvania Museum. Remarks by Professors Montgomery and Albright and Dr. Bull.

The U. of P. Museum has a collection of terra-cotta bowls from Nippur, each of which bears an inscription in Aramaic, Syriac or Mandaic. They were made for the purpose of exorcising demons.

Dr. WILLIAM J. CHAPMAN, of New Boston, Mass.: (a) The Relationship of Hezekiah to Ahaz; (b) A Further Remark upon the Early Kings of Uruk.

(a) Factors involved: a) dates common to Biblical and cuneiform sources, B. C. 722 (II Kg. 17: 6; 18: 10) and 701 (II Kg. 18: 13); b) difference of their respective ages (II Kg. 16: 2; 18: 2)—eleven years; Ahaz accused of child-sacrifice c. 16: 3,—inferences therefrom; c) Messianic prophecy—e. g. Isaianic; d) chronological 'experiments' based on the equations B. C. 722 = 9 Hoshea (= 4 Hezekiah) and 701 = 14 Hezekiah.

(b) A remark upon the paper presented at the Toronto meeting (JAOS. 50. 340).

Professor W. R. TAYLOR, of the University of Toronto: A New Syriac Source dealing with an Instance in the Crusades. Remarks by Professors Barton, Albright, Gottheil, and Olmstead, and President Morgenstern.

The material is drawn from the Codicil of a Syriac Lectionary in the Assyrian Convent of St. Mark in Jerusalem.

At this point the chairman made the suggestion that the Society might well initiate a project of reproducing Syriac and other manuscripts in the Near East by the use of motion picture film.

On motion it was voted to refer the suggestion to the directors of the Society for their consideration.

Professor W. F. ALBRIGHT, of the Johns Hopkins University: The Empire of Sargon of Accad according to Babylonian Geographers.

In *JAOS*, 1925, the writer published a study of a geographical text purporting to refer to the conquest of Sargon of Accad. Other studies have since been published, the most important of which is by Emil Forrer, based partly on a new collation of the text. Forrer, followed by others, refers the text to Sargon I of Assyria (twentieth century B. C.), a view which seems impossible. Forrer's other views, where they diverge from ours, appear nearly always contrary to the facts, as will be pointed out in some detail.

Professor JAMES A. MONTGOMERY, of the University of Pennsylvania: Contamination of the Hebrew Text of Kings from Chronicles. Remarks by Professors Gottheil and Cadbury and President Morgenstern.

At this point Professor N. Schmidt took the chair.

Dr. GEORGE A. KOHUT, of the Jewish Institute of Religion: A Hebrew Commencement Oration delivered at Yale University by President Ezra Stiles on September 12, 1781. Read by Professor Torrey.

Ezra Stiles, one of the outstanding Hebraists in his day in America, had already delivered an Oration in Hebrew in July, 1778, on the occasion of his inaugural as President of Yale College. There is no written record of it among his private papers, but there are two transcripts of the Commencement Oration delivered by him on September 12, 1781. While this sounds strange to the Jewish ear, it is, for all its quaintness and occasional unintelligibility, a real contribution to the history of the study of the sacred tongue in America and its use as a medium of literary expression. A collection of the Hebrew writings of Stiles, edited by George Alexander Kohut, is expected to appear in the *Yale Oriental Series*.

Professor A. T. OLMSTEAD, of the University of Chicago: The Historical Joshua. Remarks by President Morgenstern, Professors Gottheil, Albright, Montgomery, and N. Schmidt, and Dr. Chapman.

*Amarna letter Kn. 256 mentions Aiab, Benenima, and Iashuia, names long since compared with Job, Benjamin, and Joshua. Benenima and Iashuia are east of Jordan, not far from Adam, Joshua's crossing place in earlier tradition. Jericho, Ai, and Bethel were destroyed

about 'Amarna times. Iashua may therefore be the historical Joshua and Benenima the "ancestor" of the Benjamin tribe. The form Iashua would then prove that Joshua's original name was not Yehoshua or Hoshea and had nothing to do with Yahweh, but was Yeshua as in certain Biblical passages, a Phoenician seal, and Kefr Ishua near Joshua's traditional grave.

Professor GEORGE A. BARTON, of the University of Pennsylvania: Some Observations as to the Origin of the Babylonian Syllabary. Remarks by Professor Albright.

The paper is an attempt to show that certain elements of the Babylonian syllabary are derived from the non-Semitic, pre-Sumerian race who wrote the pictographic tablets found at Jemdet Nasr.

At 12.30 P. M. the members met in general session, with Vice-President Olmstead presiding owing to the illness of President Laufer.

It was announced that the Directors had decided to hold the next meeting at the University of Chicago in Easter Week 1932.

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

It was announced that the Directors recommended that Article V, Section 1, and Article VII of the Constitution of the Society should be amended to provide for three editors of the JOURNAL instead of two, by substituting "three" for "two" in the third line of Article V, Section 1 and the first line of Article VII before "Editors." Upon putting it to a vote the proposed amendment was passed unanimously.

ELECTION OF EDITOR

To fill the post thus created the name of Dr. John Knight Shryock of Philadelphia was proposed by the Committee on Nominations and he was duly elected.

The newly-printed catalogue of the Society's library was exhibited to the members present.

Professor Torrey reported for the Committee on the Library of Ancient Semitic Inscriptions.

Professor W. N. Brown reported for the Committee on a School of Indic and Iranian Studies. Upon motion it was voted to discharge this Committee with thanks.

Professor Montgomery reported for the Committee on the Amer-

ican Schools of Oriental Research, and Professor Barton added a report on the School at Baghdād.

Upon motion Professor Albert T. Olmstead was elected the Society's representative on the Board of the American Schools of Oriental Research.

The session adjourned at 12.55 P. M.

THE FOURTH SESSION

The fourth session was called to order at 2.40 P. M. on Wednesday afternoon, with Vice-President Olmstead in the chair.

REPORT OF THE DELEGATES TO THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Professor Edgerton read the following report for the delegates to the American Council of Learned Societies:

At its annual meeting in New York, January 30-31, 1931, the Council continued its Committee on the American School in India, changing its name to the Committee on Indic and Iranian Studies. Other standing Committees of the Council, either new or old, which deal with subjects of interest to our Society, are those on Chinese Studies, on Japanese Studies, on Mediterranean Antiquities, on Byzantine Studies, and on a Survey of Indonesian Customary Law in the Philippine Islands. Further appropriations for projects already under way were made for the Survey of Materials and Facilities for Chinese Studies in this country, and for the Excavation of Samaria. New appropriations, for projects either not yet begun or not previously supported by the Council, were made for the publication of the Ethiopic Text of Ecclesiastes, for the excavation of Jerash, for a Thesaurus of Hebrew Oriental Melodies, and for the publication of the second volume of the Vedic Variants (the first volume of which was published with the Council's aid in December 1930).

Your delegates, both of whom attended these meetings, were impressed by the marked interest shown by the Council as a whole, and by its executive officers in particular, in oriental studies. It is their opinion that the work of the Council is extremely beneficial to the progress of orientalism in this country.

Attention may be particularly called to the Fellowships and Grants in Aid of Research controlled by the Council. In 1930 fourteen fellowships amounting in total to about \$38,000 were granted, and thirty-four Grants in Aid of Research, amounting in total to \$54,450, and varying in amount from \$200 to \$2,000. It is believed that few of these sums went to orientalists, but that this is due only to their failure to file applications. It is suggested that our members keep these opportunities in mind.

The Corresponding Secretary reported on the new Fellowships under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies.

Professor Torrey reported on the Semi-Centennial meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

The Corresponding Secretary reported for the Committee on Enlargement of Membership and Resources.

The Corresponding Secretary presented summarily a report by Chancellor Magnes on the Hebrew University at Jerusalem.

APPOINTMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEES

It was announced that the President had appointed the following to constitute the Committee on Arrangements for the next Annual Meeting: Professors Breasted, Olmstead, and Sellers, Dr. Laufer, Mr. Henry Field, Mr. Kelley, and the Corresponding Secretary *ex officio*.

As a Committee on the Nomination of Officers for the year 1932 he appointed Professors Albright, Clark, and Reich.

As Auditors he appointed Professors Dougherty and Latourette.

Upon motion the following minute was unanimously adopted by a rising vote:

RESOLUTION OF THANKS.

The American Oriental Society, as it looks back with pleasant recollections upon the few days spent in Princeton on the occasion of its 143rd meeting, desires to express its hearty appreciation of the hospitality so generously offered by Princeton University and by Princeton Theological Seminary, and of the courtesies extended to its members by the Nassau Club and the Present Day Club. It also expresses its hearty thanks to Professor Hitti and the other members of the local committee on arrangements for the care they have taken to make us so happy and so comfortable. And, looking forward, we express to Mr. Ralph W. Downes, Organist and Music Director of the University Chapel, our appreciation of the musical programme with which he is going to favor us.

The reading of papers was then begun.

Professor RICHARD GOTTHEIL, of Columbia University: Taimūr Pasha, Theodor Nöldeke and Eduard Sachau: an Appreciation. Remarks by Professors Torrey and Zwemer. (Printed in JOURNAL 51. 104-107.)

Professor HENRY J. CADBURY, of Bryn Mawr College: Some Semitic Personal Names in Luke-Acts. Remarks by President Morgenstern, Professors Albright, Olmstead, and Kent, and Dr. Chapman.

This paper points out that certain names like Chuzas, Mnason,

(Bar)nabas, (Bar)sabbas, Sapphira, and Silas that were formerly unique or suspected of Greek origin are increasingly confirmed of Semitic character.

President JULIAN MORGENSTERN, of the Hebrew Union College: A Significant Tendency of Early Post-Exilic Judaism. Remarks by Professors Barton, Zwemer, and Montgomery.

This paper will endeavor to show the full import in the evolution of post-Exilic Judaism of the belief that Yahwe had definitely taken up his residence in the Temple at Jerusalem, and that in consequence thereof, sanctuary, land and people had become *qadosh*, holy, with the resultant necessity of preserving this three-fold holiness at all costs and in every way possible, so that Yahwe might not have occasion to once more withdraw from his sanctuary and thus leave Israel without a protecting deity.

At this point, a motion having been duly made, it was unanimously voted to send to President Laufer, who had been obliged to return home because of illness, the regrets of the Society for his indisposition and hearty wishes for a speedy recovery.

Professor Duyvendak of the University of Leiden then presented an invitation to the members of the Society to attend the International Congress of Orientalists at Leiden in September.

Professor A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, of Columbia University: The Manichæan System of Ethics.

The purpose of this paper is to present in a brief form from the various Manichæan sources, direct and indirect, the main points of the code of morality and system of ethics which Mānī enjoined upon his followers and which he summarized in his 'Ten Commandments.'

At this point the members present, by a rising vote and by applause, testified to their affection for Professor Hopkins and recorded their congratulation of him upon his completing fifty years of membership in the Society.

Professor E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, of Yale University: The Divinity of Kings. (Printed in JOURNAL 51. 309-16.)

Professor CHARLES C. TORREY, of Yale University: The Origin of the Term 'Islām.' Remarks by Professors Zwemer and Hitti.

Professor WALTER E. CLARK, of Harvard University: The Staël-Holstein Collection of Lamaistic Pantheons.

Three years ago Baron A. von Staël-Holstein brought to Cambridge and presented to Harvard University copies of four Lamaistic pantheons. The first is a copy of the pantheon of the Chang Chia Hutuktu

Lalitavajra (300 figures) which has been described by Pander and published in the fifth volume of the *Bibliotheca Buddhica*. The second is a complete series of photographs of the so-called "Five Hundred Gods of Narthang." The third is a set of photographs from a unique manuscript ascribed to an unnamed Chang Chia Hutuktu, and containing 360 figures which are labelled in Manchu, Chinese, Tibetan, and Mongolian. The fourth is a set of photographs of 756 statuettes preserved in a Lama Temple in the Forbidden City in Peiping. The names are inscribed in Chinese. At present I am engaged in the publication of the last two pantheons, in preparing indexes in Chinese and Tibetan, and in making a Sanskrit index which is to contain all the names that I have been able to reconstruct from the Chinese and Tibetan. The names of the figures in the first two pantheons will be included in the Tibetan index.

Professor GEORGE W. BRIGGS, of Drew University: The Indian Rhinoceros as a Sacred Animal. Remarks by Professors Hopkins and Graham, Dr. Uhl, and Dr. Chandler. (Printed in JOURNAL 51. 276-282.)

Professor GEORGE W. BROWN, of the Hartford Seminary Foundation: Kassite and Dravidian. Remarks by Professor Olmstead and Dr. Chapman.

While we know definitely the meanings of only a few Kassite words, a large proportion of those known show striking similarities to corresponding words in Tamil and other Dravidian languages.

Miss ADELAIDE RUDOLPH, of the Columbia University Library: Robert R. Livingston as the First American Egyptologist on Record. Read by Dr. Ogden.

A passage from one of the Robert R. Livingston letters, to be published in the June number of the *Columbia University Quarterly*, shows that Chancellor Livingston (then minister plenipotentiary to France) was the first American Egyptologist on record, if not indeed the first American 'Orientalist' in the wider sense of the term.

Professor CARL H. KRAELING, of Yale University: The Syriac Apocalypse of Paul and the *Iranisches Erlösungsmysterium*. Remarks by Professor Jackson.

In Volume VIII (1864) of the *JAOS*, Dr. Perkins published a translation of a Syriac manuscript of the Apocalypse of Paul presented to the library of the AOS some years earlier by Rev. D. T. Stoddard of Urumiah. Other MSS in Greek and Latin have subsequently appeared in Europe. Due possibly to the fact that no critical edition of the text has ever been made, this document has escaped the attention of those scholars whose interest has been focused latterly upon the religious development of the later Hellenistic Orient. Yet the Apocalypse contains significant data bearing particularly upon the *Iranisches Erlösungsmysterium* of Reitzenstein, that is, upon the Iranian conception of the redemption of the soul and its fate after

the death of the body as reflected in the Manichean and Mandeian religions and other forms of late Oriental religious belief. Attention is herewith directed to three items which the Apocalypse immediately illumines, 1) the nature of the powers which come to meet the soul at death, 2) the soul's passage of the planetary sphere, and 3) the relation of the soul to its guardian spirit.

The following papers were read by title:

Dr. GEORGE A. KOHUT, of the Jewish Institute of Religion: Travels of a hitherto unknown Jewish Merchant in China in the Tenth Century.

The *Kitāb 'Ajā'ib al-Hind*, which was written in 1013 by a Persian marine captain named Buzurg ibn Shahriyar and registers various events between 900 and 953 of our era, contains among other unusual episodes the story of Ishaq the Jew, an itinerant merchant of whom we have no other record. He appears to have had several business dealings with brokers at Oman and at one time had to flee to India with 200 dinars, all that he owned in the world. After an absence of thirty years, we find him back in Oman in a vessel which he claimed was his property together with all the cargo. In order to escape a search, he paid the governor of Oman over a million dirhems outright. Accused of having acquired his riches dishonestly, he was arrested, but was released and permitted to depart for China. At the Port of Serira, he refused to pay a bribe demanded by the local functionary, whereupon that worthy sent assassins to kill him, confiscating all his property. Ishaq's own account of some of the things he had observed in China reads like a passage from the *Arabian Nights*. A brief summary in English of his adventures appears in the *H. P. Chajes Memorial Volume*, now being published under the auspices of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation.

Mr. MURRAY B. EMENEAU, of Yale University: Jambhaladatta's Version of the Vetālapañcaviṁśati.

A preliminary inquiry into the date and relationship of this version with other versions of the Vetālapañcaviṁśati, based on a study of the contents of the stories, their order and proper names. Also an examination of the language of the text with reference to grammarians' forms, barbarisms, Hindi words, and new Sanskrit words.

Professor FRANKLIN EDGEERTON, of Yale University: The Ghost-word *paḍviṁśa (Published in the JOURNAL 51. 170).

Professor MOSES BUTTENWIESER, of the Hebrew Union College: The Oldest Psalm: Psalm 68B.

The Psalm (= VV. 8-9, 16-18, 12-15, 19a-b, 25-28) is a fragment, showing four gaps: the first gap is after verse 13; the second, after verse 14a; the third, after verse 14c; the fourth, after verse 25. The conclusion is also missing. The Psalm differs radically in content

as well as in language and style from Psalm 68A (= VV. 1-7, 19c, 20-24, 29-36) which is complete (in these verses) and dates from the closing years of the exile. The theme of Psalm 68B is the victory of Deborah: like Judges 5, it was written by an eyewitness. "There is Benjamin, the least of them, that treads down the enemy" (V. 28a) is a piece of information of extreme value: it explains how Samuel came to choose Saul for king when some generations later he founded the kingdom. Verses 10-11 are an original part of Psalm 65B (= VV. 10-14). This is another ancient product—an Incantation for Rain. There is nothing as primitive as this anywhere else in the Psalter.

Miss HELEN E. FERNALD, of the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania: An Early Chinese Sculptured Stela illustrating Scenes from the 'Lotus of the Good Law' and the Vimalakīrti Sūtra.

There is, in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania, a sculptured stela of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty bearing a date corresponding to 575 A.D. The scenes on the stela illustrate passages from Buddhist sūtras, especially the sūtra known as "The Lotus of the Good Law" in which Sākyamuni and Prabhūtaratna appear side by side in a stūpa. This motive may be traced back to the earliest sculptures at Yün Kang. Another motive which appears is that of the visit of Mañjuśrī to Vimalakīrti, from the Vimalakīrti Sūtra. This familiar subject, which may be seen on so many stelae of the Wei period, seems to lose, about the end of the 6th century, its popularity as a theme for sculpture and then is revived again in the T'ang dynasty in painting, being frequently seen in 8th to late 10th century frescoes at Tun Huang. The inscription is partly in exposition of Buddhist doctrine and partly an explanation of the reasons for erecting the monument.

Professor IRA M. PRICE, of the University of Chicago: Light out of Ur: Devotion of Elamite Kings to Sumerian Deities. (Printed in JOURNAL 51. 164-169.)

Dr. DAVID I. MACHT, of the Johns Hopkins University Medical School: Experiments concerning *ṣehiṭā*, or the Hebrew Method of Slaughtering.

The author undertook a series of experiments on a large variety (ten different classes) of animals in order to ascertain the relative toxicity of the blood and various tissue extracts after different methods of slaughtering the animals. Through special physiological and pharmacological methods developed by him it was found that blood obtained by free bleeding of the animals after arteriotomy was much less toxic than blood obtained from the same species of animals after asphyxiation, after decerebration, and after other severe injuries to the brain. A comparative study of the muscle extracts after arteriotomy, asphyxiation, decerebration, and electrocution gave even more striking results in favor of the first named process. The evidence thus obtained would show that the Hebrew method of slaughtering animals

by severing the blood vessels of the throat, which has been lauded as a painless and humanitarian one, also produces meat of greater wholesomeness.

Professor WILLIAM C. GRAHAM, of the University of Chicago: Notes on the Interpretation of Micah 1: 10-16.

Dr. GEORGE C. O. HAAS, of New York City: The Brahmbindu Upanishad, translated from the Sanskrit, with elucidative comments.

Professor CLARK HOPKINS, of Yale University: The Palmyrene Gods at Doura-Europos. (Printed in JOURNAL 51. 119-137.)

The session adjourned at 6.25 P. M.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
MIDDLE WEST BRANCH
OF THE
American Oriental Society
AT THE MEETING IN OBERLIN, OHIO, 1931

The sessions of the fifteenth annual meeting of the Middle West Branch were held in Oberlin, Ohio, at Oberlin College, on Friday and Saturday, May 1 and 2, 1931.

The following members were present at one or more of the sessions:

Blank	Fullerton	Sellers
Bowman	Hail	Shier, Miss
Braden	Keyfitz	Smith, J. M. P.
Buckler	McGovern	Sprengling
Buttenwieser	MacLean	Waterman
Creighton	Morgenstern	Wilkins
Danton	Olmstead	Williams, Mrs. C. R.
Debevoise	Price	Worrell
Fuller	Pyatt	

In attendance also were the following candidates for membership:

Blair, Miss	Foster, F. H.	Williams, G.
Cameron, G.	Smeaton, Miss W.	

Mr. R. H. McDowell of the University of Michigan was present as a guest. The attendance at the meeting was augmented by the presence of the wives of some of the members and a number of Oberlin students.

THE FIRST SESSION

At 10.30 A. M. on Friday, May 1, in the West Room of the Men's Building of Oberlin College, President Moses Buttenwieser called the meeting to order. The reading of the minutes of the meeting of the Branch in Toronto in 1930 was omitted since they were already in print (JOURNAL 50. 334-335).

As treasurer of the Branch, Professor Sellers reported as follows:

Deficit reported in 1930.....	\$ 2.50
Expenditures:	
Telegram to Prof. Bittenwieser....	.45
Stamped envelopes.....	6.96
Stamps34
Mimeographing Preliminary Circular	1.00
Printing Final Circular.....	15.00
	<hr/>
	23.75
	<hr/>
	\$26.25
Received from Treasurer of the Society.....	2.50
	<hr/>
Deficit	\$23.75

It was voted that the chair appoint a nominating committee whereupon President Bittenwieser appointed Professors Fullerton, Olmstead, and Sprengling. The President also appointed Professors Price and Fuller and Mrs. Caroline Ransom Williams as a committee on resolutions.

The Branch approved the action of the executive committee in inviting the Society to hold a joint meeting in Chicago in 1932.

The Secretary read a communication from the Corresponding Secretary of the Society, Dr. Charles J. Ogden, giving information of the Society's acceptance of the invitation and expressing good wishes for the meeting of the Branch this year.

There followed the reading of papers.

Professor KEMPER FULLERTON, of Oberlin Graduate School of Theology: An Analysis of Job 9 and 10.

A study of the thought development of these chapters. Though the epilog presents Job as contrite, he had said nothing for which he should repent.

Professor CHARLES S. BRADEN, of Northwestern University: Twentieth Century Tendencies in Hinduism. Remarks by Professors McGovern, Creighton, Fullerton, and Sprengling.

Hinduism, like all other world religions, is undergoing marked changes in the 20th century. At least six tendencies may be observed:

1. A general tendency toward irreligion, something new in India.
2. A growing opposition to priestly influence and the very existence of that group which has for centuries been most revered of all India's people, the holy men.
3. A strong reactionary tendency, not unlike fundamentalism.

4. A rationalizing tendency which seeks to modernize the Hindu faith.

5. A marked syncretic tendency.

6. Most important: a tendency toward social change that is little short of revolutionary and which in turn is to have a profound effect upon religion. The most notable changes here are in the position of women (early marriage, divorce, purdah, widowhood); the breakdown of caste; and finally the reform of certain religious practices which have failed to justify themselves to the growing moral sense of India's leaders.

Mr. GEORGE G. CAMERON, of the University of Chicago: Media in the Old Testament. Remarks by Professor Olmstead.

Isaiah 13 and Jeremiah 50-51, linguistically inseparable, constitute a group of prophecies (modelled on Jer. 4 ff.) predicting the immediate overthrow of Babylon by the empire of the Medes. That 561-550 is a plausible date for their composition is indicated by the recurrence of the name "Media" itself and of a title, "King of the Medes," which Cyrus the Persian never employed; by the suggestion of civil war in Babylonia; and, besides other features, by a theme, vengeance, devoid of the Deutero-Isaiah hope of restoration at the hands of Babylon's conqueror, Cyrus.

At 12.30 the members had lunch in the Oberlin Inn as guests of Oberlin College. President Ernest Hatch Wilkins of Oberlin, in welcoming the members of the Society in a brief after-luncheon talk, referred to three points at which his own interests in the field of early Italian literature have touched the Oriental field.

The sonnet was invented at the court of the Emperor Frederick II: the sestet, which in its original form presumably rhymed CDE, CDE, was, very probably, suggested by a form of the Arabic *zağal*, instanced in the work of Abū'l Ḥasan. Great interest has been aroused among Dante scholars in recent years by the claim of Asín Palacios, in his *Escatologia musulmana en la Divina Comedia*, that Dante derived his ideas of the other world from a particular Moslem text; it seems much more probable that the ideas in question had penetrated from the East into the popular lore of Europe, and that Dante thus drew directly from his natural patrimony ideas some of which were doubtless of Oriental origin. Dante in his Seventh Heaven sees the ascending and descending of spirits upon a *scala*, which he identifies with the one seen by Jacob. What did Jacob see, and what did Dante think that Jacob saw—a ladder or a stairway? The Italian, Latin and Greek words concerned are all indecisive, and the Hebrew word is a *אֲזָלָה* *legúmenor*.

THE SECOND SESSION

At 2.00 P. M. the Branch met again in the West Room of the Men's Building and the reading of papers was resumed.

Professor IRA M. PRICE, of the University of Chicago: Notes on the Right of the First-born in Early Sumer and the Old Testament. Remarks by President Morgenstern and Professor Keyfitz.

From an unmeasured antiquity the first-born has been regarded with a kind of sanctity. In the Old Testament Yahweh says: "He is mine." His superior position gave him special consideration even in early Sumer. In all Babylonia he was accorded a chief place in the partition of estates among the heirs. This priority was recognized in Nippur by giving him two parts of his father's estate. Such a privileged part was recognized in Kirkuk and the Assyrian code. The Hebrews, while recognizing the first-born, gave him no such consideration until the Deuteronomic period. On the whole the Old Testament method of dividing estates was that of the sweet will of the parents.

Professor LESLIE E. FULLER, of Garrett Biblical Institute: The Number 40. Remarks by Professor Worrell and President Morgenstern.

Study of the number 40 as it appears in Biblical literature, late Jewish literature, and the Kor'an. The number is rarely used to express a definite limit, but more frequently used in the sense of "some" or "many." Especially associated with great leaders. Most of the references appear in the later literature. This peculiar use of the number is characteristically Semitic. The origin of the number is still a matter of conjecture. There are some indications that it denoted a generation, the full maturity of a man, semi-sacred qualities, and the idea of completeness.

Professor A. T. OLMSTEAD, of the University of Chicago: Josiah's Reform. Remarks by Professor McGovern.

Professor SHELDON H. BLANK, of Hebrew Union College: The Ben Naftali Bible Manuscripts. Remarks by Professors Fuller and Sellers.

Kahle has succeeded in isolating Bible MSS. which, because of *formal* characteristics possessed by them in common form a single group and may with reasonable certainty be assigned to the tradition of the Massoretic authority Ben Naftali. May these MSS. be grouped together because of similarities in the *consonant* text as well? Soundings in the apparatus of the Ginsburg Bible only reveal the complicated nature of the problem. Consonantal variants in a MS. from the Hebrew Union College Library are, however, found predominantly in the MSS. punctuated after the style of Ben Naftali. Investigations of this sort may eventually yield more positive results.

After a brief recess Professor Fullerton reported for the com-

mittee on nominations. The report was accepted and the following officers for 1931-1932 were unanimously elected:

President, Professor W. H. WORRELL.

Vice-President, Mr. CHARLES FABENS KELLEY.

Secretary-Treasurer, Professor O. R. SELLERS.

Members of the Executive Committee, Professor MOSES BUTTENWIESER and Mr. HENRY FIELD.

The reading of papers was resumed.

Professor MARTIN SPRENGLING, of the University of Chicago: Ṭaha Ḥusain of Cairo, a Factor in the Rise of Asia.

An appreciation of the scholarship and vision of Ṭaha Ḥusain in bringing about the advance of the Moslem world and its adaptation to modern conditions.

Professor FRANCIS W. BUCKLER, of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology: The Chronology of Cosmas, Patriarch of Alexandria.

Cosmas wrote to Pope Paul I (757-765) a letter which was forwarded to Pippin and may have contained the suggestion of the Frankish mission to Baghdād in that year. The paper has been published in the reader's *Hārūnu 'l-Rashīd and Charles the Great* (Appendix II).

Professor O. R. SELLERS, of the Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago: Palestine Excavations in the Summer of 1930 (illustrated).

An exhibition of motion pictures and slides showing some of the work done in 1930 at Jerash and at Tell Beit Mirsim.

At 6.00 p. m. the members with some guests met for dinner at the Oberlin Inn.

THE THIRD SESSION

At 8.00 p. m. the third session was called to order and Professor Moses Bittenwieser, of Hebrew Union College, delivered the Presidential Address: The Psalms as a Source of Post-Exilic History.

This was followed by another paper.

Professor J. M. Powis Smith, of the University of Chicago: Some Aspects of the Pre-Exilic Hebrew Idea of God.

The local committee on arrangements—Professors Buckler, Fullerton, and Danton—then served coffee to the members and also to the Oberlin Japanese and Chinese clubs.

THE FOURTH SESSION

The fourth session was called to order at 10.00 A. M. Saturday, May 2.

Professor Price reported for the committee on resolutions and the following resolutions were adopted:

We would express our hearty appreciation of the abundant provision made by Oberlin College, through its efficient committee, especially Professor Buckler, for our entertainment and our personal convenience and comfort. This venerable institution, with its wealth of history, has fully maintained its reputation for generosity toward all departments of human progress. We are grateful for the use of its buildings and for the luncheon given to the Branch by the College.

We would also record our pleasure in the cordial reception given to the members of the Society by our fellow member, President Wilkins of Oberlin College.

The reading of papers was resumed.

Professor W. H. WORRELL, of the University of Michigan: *Egyptian Sounds; Main Currents of their History* (illustrated). Remarks by President Morgenstern.

Method and some new results of studying Egyptian sounds in the light of general phonetics. Dialectic grand divisions. Great changes. Forward movement and its meaning. New values for Egyptological symbols and for Phoenician letters. Evolution of roots.

Professor W. M. MCGOVERN, of Northwestern University: *Ural-Altaic Peoples in Culture History*. Remarks by Professors Olmstead and Worrell.

Professor LEROY WATERMAN, of the University of Michigan: *The Season's Work at Seleucia-on-the-Tigris* (illustrated). Remarks by Professors Bittenwieser, McGovern, and Olmstead.

Dr. NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE, of the University of Michigan: *The Parthian Pottery found at Seleucia*.

Mr. R. H. McDOWELL, of the University of Michigan: *Numismatic and Other Chronological Evidence from Seleucia*.

Coins and dated bullae indicate that the earliest (fourth) level extended from the reign of Seleucus I to about 147 B. C.; and the third to 41-43 A. D.; the second to 112-125; the first to 202. There are evidences of intentional destruction about 147 B. C., when Seleucid coinage ceases; about 41-43 A. D., when autonomous coinage is replaced by Parthian, the use of the column by vaulting, and Parthian culture prevails exclusively; about 112-125, emphasized by major fire debris; and about 166, accompanied by coin and jewelry hoards. Hoards occur also in 178 and 199. Decay, not violence, marks the end.

President JULIAN MORGENSTERN, of Hebrew Union College: The Historical Background of I Kings 19; Isaiah 6; Jeremiah 7.

Mr. J. ARTHUR MACLEAN, of the Toledo Museum of Art: The Toledo Museum's Cambodian Stone Terminal.

The Cambodian stone terminal in the Toledo Museum is an imposing sculptural ornament, of a type rare in America. It is from the Ankor ruins. The mythical Garuda, half-bird and half-human, is seated astride a multiple-headed serpent, the sacred Naga, whose long extended body formed the rail of a stairway or bridge, with a corresponding rail and terminal opposite. Against the massive feathered wings the full-breasted naked torso of the Garuda stands out in high relief. In high relief also are the five reared heads of the Naga. The design is highly decorative, with natural form suggested rather than realistically depicted, but with no sacrifice of form at any point.

The following paper was read by title:

Professor ROBERT J. KELLOGG, of the University of Kansas: The Problem of Indo-European Origins.

To the Mesolithic Period belongs the first appearance of the races whose units later emerged in history as Indo-European-speaking peoples. Besides the Mediterranean race, which can hardly by any possibility have been an original bearer of IE speech and culture, two other racial groups were concerned. In the North, the Nordic and similar blond types (Kelts, Teutons, Balto-Slavs, Tocharians, etc.) came from the East by way of the steppes and spread over the European Plain and Scandinavia. In the South, the Alpines, and other resembling dark-haired races, spread along the passes and plateaus of the World Mountain Range from Persia over Armenia, Asia Minor, and the Balkan lands as far as the Alps and the Valley of the Rhine. IE ethnic expansion into the IE Area, therefore, dates back to the Mesolithic Period, or say around 10,000 or 12,000 B. C.

At 12.20 the Branch adjourned.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS

OF THE

AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY

CONSTITUTION

ARTICLE I. This Society shall be called the AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.

ARTICLE II. The objects contemplated by this society shall be:—

1. The cultivation of learning in the Asiatic, African, and Polynesian languages, as well as the encouragement of researches of any sort by which the knowledge of the East may be promoted.

2. The cultivation of a taste for Oriental studies in this country.

3. The publication of memoirs, translations, vocabularies, and other communications, presented to the Society, which may be valuable with reference to the before-mentioned objects.

4. The collection of a library and cabinet.

ARTICLE III. The membership of the Society shall consist of corporate members, honorary members, and honorary associates.

ARTICLE IV. SECTION 1. Honorary members and honorary associates shall be proposed for membership by the Directors, at some stated meeting of the Society, and no person shall be elected a member of either class without receiving the votes of as many as three-fourths of all the members present at the meeting.

SECTION 2. Candidates for corporate membership may be proposed and elected in the same manner as honorary members and honorary associates. They may also be proposed at any time by any member in regular standing. Such proposals shall be in writing and shall be addressed to the Corresponding Secretary, who shall thereupon submit them to the Executive Committee for its action. A unanimous vote of the Executive Committee shall be necessary in order to elect.

ARTICLE V. SECTION 1. The government of the Society shall consist of a President, three Vice-Presidents, a Corresponding Secretary, a Recording Secretary, a Treasurer, a Librarian, three Editors of the JOURNAL, the President and the Secretary of any duly authorized branch of the Society, and nine Directors. The officers of the Society shall be elected at the annual meeting, by ballot, for a term of one year. The Directors shall consist of three groups of three members each, one group to be elected each year at the annual meeting for a term of three years. No Director shall be eligible for immediate re-election as Director, tho he may be chosen as an officer of the Society.

SECTION 2. An Executive Committee, consisting of the President, Corresponding Secretary, and Treasurer, and two other Directors each elected

for a term of two years, shall be constituted by the Board of Directors. The Executive Committee shall have power to take action provisionally in the name of the Society on matters of importance which may arise between meetings of the Society or of the Board of Directors, and on which, in the Committee's opinion, action cannot be postponed without injury to the interests of the Society. Notice of all actions taken by the Executive Committee shall be printed as soon as possible in the JOURNAL, and shall be reported to the Directors and the Society at the succeeding annual meeting. Unless such actions, after being thus duly advertised and reported, are disapproved by a majority vote of the members present at any session of the succeeding annual meeting, they shall be construed to have been ratified and shall stand as actions of the Society.

ARTICLE VI. The President and Vice-Presidents shall perform the customary duties of such officers, and shall be *ex officio* members of the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE VII. The Secretaries, the Treasurer, the Librarian, and the three Editors of the JOURNAL shall be *ex officio* members of the Board of Directors, and shall perform their respective duties under the superintendence of said Board.

ARTICLE VIII. It shall be the duty of the Board of Directors to regulate the financial concerns of the Society, to superintend its publications, to carry into effect the resolutions and orders of the Society, and to exercise a general supervision over its affairs. Five Directors at any regular meeting shall be a quorum for doing business.

ARTICLE IX. An annual meeting of the Society shall be held during Easter week, the days and place of the meeting to be determined by the Directors. One or more other meetings, at the discretion of the Directors, may also be held each year at such place and time as the Directors shall determine.

ARTICLE X. To provide for scientific meetings of groups of members living at too great a distance to attend the annual sessions of the Society, branches may be organized with the approval of the Directors. The details of organization are to be left to those forming a branch thus authorized, subject to formal ratification by the Directors.

ARTICLE XI. This Constitution may be amended, on a recommendation of the Directors, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at an annual meeting.

BY-LAWS

I. The Corresponding Secretary shall conduct the correspondence of the Society; and he shall notify the meetings in such manner as the President or the Board of Directors shall direct.

II. The Recording Secretary shall keep a record of the proceedings of the Society in a book provided for the purpose.

III. *a.* The Treasurer shall have charge of the funds of the Society; and

his investments, deposits, and payments shall be made under the superintendence of the Board of Directors. At each annual meeting he shall report the state of the finances, with a brief summary of the receipts and payments of the previous year.

III. *b.* After December 31, 1896, the fiscal year of the Society shall correspond with the calendar year.

III. *c.* At each annual business meeting in Easter week, the President shall appoint an auditing committee of two men—preferably men residing in or near the town where the Treasurer lives—to examine the Treasurer's accounts and vouchers, and to inspect the evidences of the Society's property, and to see that the funds called for by his balances are in his hands. The Committee shall perform this duty as soon as possible after the New Year's day succeeding their appointment, and shall report their findings to the Society at the next annual business meeting thereafter. If these findings are satisfactory, the Treasurer shall receive his acquittance by a certificate to that effect, which shall be recorded in the Treasurer's book, and published in the Proceedings.

IV. The Librarian shall keep a catalogue of all books belonging to the Society, with the names of the donors, if they are presented, and shall at each annual meeting make a report of the accessions to the library during the previous year, and shall be farther guided in the discharge of his duties by such rules as the Directors shall prescribe.

V. All papers read before the Society, and all manuscripts deposited by authors for publication, or for other purposes, shall be at the disposal of the Board of Directors, unless notice to the contrary is given to the Editors at the time of presentation.

VI. Each corporate member shall pay into the treasury of the Society an annual assessment of five dollars; but shall be exempted from obligation to make this payment (*a*) in case he or she shall have made at any one time a donation of one hundred dollars during the first decade of membership, or (*b*) of seventy-five dollars during the second decade, or (*c*) of fifty dollars during the third decade, or (*d*) of twenty-five dollars during the fourth decade, or (*e*) when he or she shall have completed forty years of membership, or (*f*) on application, if he or she, having been a member for twenty years and having attained the age of seventy, shall have retired from the active exercise of the teaching profession or of the ministry.

VII. Every member shall be entitled to one copy of all current numbers of the JOURNAL issued during his membership, provided that he has paid his annual assessment for the previous year. Back volumes of the JOURNAL shall be furnished to members in regular standing at twenty per cent reduction from the list price. All other publications of the Society may be furnished to members at such reductions in price as the Directors may determine.

VIII. Candidates for corporate membership who have been elected shall qualify as members by payment of the first annual assessment within one

month from the time when notice of such election is mailed to them, or, in the case of persons not residing in the United States, within a reasonable time. A failure so to qualify, unless explained to the satisfaction of the Executive Committee, shall entitle the Committee to annul the election. If any corporate member shall for two years fail to pay his assessments, his name may, after formal notification, be dropped from the list of members of the Society at the discretion of the Executive Committee.

SUPPLEMENTARY BY-LAWS

I. FOR THE LIBRARY

1. The Library shall be accessible for consultation to all members of the Society, at such times as the Library of Yale College, with which it is deposited, shall be open for a similar purpose; further, to such persons as shall receive the permission of the Librarian, or of the Librarian or Assistant Librarian of Yale College.

2. Any member shall be allowed to draw books from the Library upon the following conditions: he shall give his receipt for them to the Librarian, pledging himself to make good any detriment the Library may suffer from their loss or injury, the amount of said detriment to be determined by the Librarian, with the assistance of the President, or of a Vice-President; and he shall return them within a time not exceeding three months from that of their reception, unless by special agreement with the Librarian this term shall be extended.

3. Persons not members may also, on special grounds, and at the discretion of the Librarian, be allowed to take and use the Society's books, upon depositing with the Librarian a sufficient security that they shall be duly returned in good condition, or their loss or damage fully compensated.

II. ON THE ORGANIZATION OF BRANCHES

1. Upon the formation of a branch, as provided in the Constitution, the officers chosen shall have the right to propose for corporate membership in the Society such persons as may seem eligible to them, and, pending ratification according to Article IV of the Constitution, these candidates shall receive the JOURNAL and all notices issued by the Society.

2. The annual fee of the members of a branch shall be collected by the Treasurer of the Society, in the usual manner, and in order to defray the current expenses of a branch the Directors shall authorize the Treasurer of the Society to forward from time to time to the duly authorized officer of the branch such sums as may seem proper to the Treasurer. The accounts of the Treasurer of the branch shall be audited annually and a statement of the audit shall be sent to the Treasurer of the Society to be included in his annual report.

LIST OF MEMBERS

The number placed after the address indicates the year of election.

† Designates members deceased since the annual meeting.

HONORARY MEMBERS

- Prof. IGNAZIO GUIDI, University of Rome, Italy. (Via Botteghe Oscure 24.) 1893.
- Prof. ARCHIBALD H. SAYCE, University of Oxford, England. 1893.
- Prof. ADOLF ERMANN, University of Berlin, Germany. (Peter Lennéstr. 36, Berlin-Dahlem.) 1903.
- Sir GEORGE A. GRIERSON, K.C.I.E., Rathfarnham, Camberley, Surrey, England. Corporate Member, 1889; Honorary, 1905.
- Prof. HERMANN JACOBI, University of Bonn, Germany. (Niebuhrstrasse 59.) 1909.
- Prof. C. SNOUCK HURGRONJE, University of Leiden, Netherlands. (Rapenburg 61.) 1914.
- Prof. SYLVAIN LÉVI, Collège de France, Paris, France. (9 Rue Guy-de-la-Brosse, Paris, Ve.) 1917.
- FRANÇOIS THUREAU-DANGIN, Membre de l'Institut de France, Musée du Louvre, Paris, France. 1918.
- Sir ARTHUR EVANS, Ashmolean, Oxford, England. 1919.
- Prof. V. SCHEIL, Membre de l'Institut de France, 4bis Rue du Cherche-Midi, Paris, France. 1920.
- Prof. FREDERICK W. THOMAS, University of Oxford, England. 1920.
- Rév. Père M.-J. LAGRANGE, Ecole archéologique française de Palestine, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1921.
- DON LEONE CAETANI, DUCA DI SERMONETA, R. Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome, Italy. 1922.
- Prof. MORIZ WINTERNITZ, German University of Prague, Czechoslovakia. (Prague II, Opatovická 8.) 1923.
- Prof. PAUL PELLLOT, Collège de France, Paris, France. (38 Rue de Varenne, Paris, VIIe.) 1924.
- Prof. KURT SETHE, University of Berlin, Germany. (Berlin-Wilmersdorf, Konstanzerstr. 36.) 1927.
- Sir JOHN MARSHALL, Kt., C.I.E., Litt.D., Gorton Castle, Simla, India. 1928.
- Prof. FLINDERS PETRIE, Kt., D.C.L., University College, London, England. 1928.
- Sir AUREL STEIN, Litt.D., c/o The President, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, England. 1928.
- Prof. WILHELM GEIGER, München-Neubiberg, Germany. 1929.
- Prof. CARL BROCKELMANN, Dahnstr. 47, Wilhelmsruh, Breslau, Germany. 1931.
- Prof. F. LLEWELLYN GRIFFITH, University of Oxford, England. (11 Norham Gardens, Oxford.) 1931.

Prof. HEINRICH LÜDERS, University of Berlin, Germany. (Berlin-Charlottenburg, Sybelstr. 19.) 1931.

Prof. HENRI MASPÉRO, Collège de France, Paris, France. 1931.

Prof. JACOB WACKERNAGEL, University of Basle, Switzerland. (Gartenstr. 93.) Corporate Member, 1921; Honorary, 1931.

[Total: 25]

HONORARY ASSOCIATES

Field Marshal Viscount ALLENBY, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., Naval and Military Club, London, England. 1922.

HON. CHARLES R. CRANE, 655 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

†Rev. Dr. OTIS A. GLAZEBROOK, American Consul, Nice, France. 1921.

Pres. Emeritus FRANK J. GOODNOW, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1921.

HON. CHARLES EVANS HUGHES, Chief Justice, The Supreme Court of the United States, Washington, D. C. 1922.

HON. HENRY MORGENTHAU, 417 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.

HON. SAO-KE ALFRED SZE, Chinese Legation, London, England. 1922.

[Total: 6]

CORPORATE MEMBERS

Names marked with * are those of life members.

MARCUS AARON, 5564 Aylesboro Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1921.

MOSTAFA ABBASI, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1927.

*Rev. Dr. JUSTIN EDWARDS ABBOTT, 120 Hobart Ave., Summit, N. J. 1900.

*Pres. CYBUS ADLER (Dropsie College), 2041 North Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1884.

Dr. MEHMET AGA-OGLU, Curator of Near Eastern Art, The Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit, Mich. 1930.

Prof. A. WILLIAM AHL, Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa. 1926.

Prof. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR (Univ. of Madras), "Sriyayavasam," 1 East Mada St., Mylapore, Madras, India. 1921.

P. L. AJIZ, M.A., The Modern High School, Allahabad, U. P., India. 1929.

Prof. WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1915.

Prof. T. GEORGE ALLEN (Univ. of Chicago), 5460 Ridgewood Court, Chicago, Ill. 1917.

Prof. OSWALD T. ALLIS, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1528 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.

NAZMIE H. ANABTAWY, Jaffa, Palestine. 1925.

Prof. A. J. ANBIAN, M.A., Cambridge Institute, Nazareth, S. India. 1928.

Rev. THEODORE ANDREWS, La Jolla, Calif. 1928.

Prof. SHIGERU ARAKI, The Peeress' School, Aoyama, Tokyo, Japan. 1915.

Prof. J. C. ARCHER (Yale Univ.), Box 1848, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1916.

Rev. ROBERT C. ARMSTRONG, Ph.D., 85 Asquith Ave., Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1926.

JULEAN ARNOLD, LL.D., 502 Dallas Building, Shanghai, China. 1931.

- Mrs. FLORENCE AYSCOUGH, Litt.D., c/o Lyceum Club, 138 Piccadilly, London, England. 1931.
- Mrs. SIMON BACHARACH, 1040 Winding Way, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1928.
- Prof. WILLIAM FREDERIC BADÈ (Pacific School of Religion), 2616 College Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1920.
- Rev. FREDERICK A. BAEPLER, 3128 Belmont Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1926.
- Prof. MOSES BAILEY (Wellesley College), 6 Norfolk Terrace, Wellesley, Mass. 1922.
- CHARLES CHANEY BAKER, 1180 Patio Place, Los Angeles, Calif. 1916.
- Rabbi BERNARD J. BAMBERGER, 206 State St., Albany, N. Y. 1927.
- LOUIS BAMBERGER, c/o L. Bamberger & Co., Newark, N. J. 1928.
- * Dr. HUBERT BANNING, 17 East 128th St., New York, N. Y. 1915.
- Prof. P. V. BAPAT, 349 Harvard St., Cambridge, Mass. 1930.
- Mrs. EARL H. BARBER, Wardman Park, Washington, D. C. 1925.
- * PHILIP LEMONT BARBOUR, 191 Indian Road, Piedmont, Calif. 1917.
- Rabbi HENRY BARNSTON, Ph.D., 1919 Richmond St., Houston, Texas. 1921.
- * Prof. LEROY CARB BARRET, Trinity College, Hartford, Conn. 1903.
- * Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON (Univ. of Pennsylvania), N. E. Cor. 43rd and Spruce Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1888.
- Mrs. DANIEL M. BATES, 51 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass. 1912.
- Prof. MINER SEARLE BATES, University of Nanking, Nanking, China. 1926.
- Prof. LORING W. BATTEN (General Theol. Seminary), 6 Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1894.
- * Prof. HARLAN P. BEACH, Winter Park, Fla. 1898.
- Miss VIRGINIA BEADLE, 1 West 67th St., New York, N. Y. 1927.
- Mrs. GEORGE F. BECKER, 1700 Rhode Island Ave., Washington, D. C. 1927.
- Rev. WILLIAM Y. BELL, Ph.D., Gammon Theological Seminary, Atlanta, Ga. 1923.
- Prof. ALFRED R. BELLINGER (Yale Univ.), 234 Fountain St., New Haven, Conn. 1929.
- * Prof. SHRI PAD K. BELVALKAR (Deccan College), Bilvakunja, Bhamburda, Poona, India. 1914.
- * ALBERT FARWELL BEMIS, 40 Central St., Boston, Mass. 1927.
- Prof. HAROLD H. BENDER, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1906.
- Rev. CHARLES D. BENJAMIN, Ph.D., Somerton, Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- Prof. C. THEODORE BENZE, D.D. (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 7304 Boyer St., Mt. Airy, Pa. 1916.
- Rabbi MORTON M. BERMAN, Jewish Institute of Religion, 40 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- OSCAR BERMAN, Third and Plum Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- PIERRE A. BERNARD, Clarkstown Country Club, Nyack, N. Y. 1914.
- ISAAC W. BERNHEIM, 825 York St., Denver, Colo. 1920.
- Dr. SIMON BERNSTEIN, 111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Prof. GEORGE R. BERRY (Colgate-Rochester Divinity School), 300 Alexander St., Rochester, N. Y. 1907.
- Prof. JULIUS A. BEWER (Union Theol. Seminary), 606 West 122nd St., New York, N. Y. 1929 (1907).

- Prof. D. R. BHANDARKAR (Univ. of Calcutta), 35 Ballygunge Circular Road, Calcutta, India. 1921.
- WOODBIDGE BINGHAM, 1921 Capistrano Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1931.
- CARL W. BISHOP, American Legation, Peiping, China. 1917.
- Prof. F. LOVELL BIXBY, The Rice Institute, Houston, Texas. 1928.
- Rabbi EUGENE BLACHSCHLEGER, 3122 Kensington Ave., Richmond, Va. 1928.
- Miss DOROTHY BLAIR, Assistant Curator, Toledo Museum of Art, Toledo, Ohio. 1931.
- Pres. JAMES A. BLAISDELL, Claremont Colleges, Claremont, Calif. 1928.
- Prof. FRANK RINGGOLD BLAKE (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 1600 Park Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1900.
- Rabbi SHELDON H. BLANK, Ph.D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1926.
- Rev. Dr. JOSHUA BLOCH, New York Public Library, 476 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. LEONARD BLOOMFIELD, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1927 (1917).
- Mrs. MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, c/o Townsend Scott and Son, 209 East Fayette St., Baltimore, Md. 1928.
- Prof. PAUL F. BLOOMHARDT, Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio. 1916.
- EMANUEL BOASBERG, 1296 Delaware Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1921.
- Dr. GEORGE V. BOBRINSKOY, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1925.
- Rev. PAUL OLAF BODDING, Mohulpahari, Santal Parganas, India. 1928.
- Prof. FRANZ M. T. BÖHL, D.D., Ph.D. (Univ. of Leiden), Rapenburg 53, Leiden, Holland. 1928.
- Rev. AUGUST M. BOLDUC, S.T.L., The Marist College, Brookland, Washington, D. C. 1921.
- *Prof. GEORGE M. BOLLING (Ohio State Univ.), 777 Franklin Ave., Columbus, Ohio. 1896.
- Prof. CAMPBELL BONNER, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1920.
- Prof. CLARENCE BOUMA, Th.D. (Calvin College), 925 Alexander St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 1928.
- RAYMOND A. BOWMAN (Northwestern Univ.), 6621 Ingleside Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- Rev. A. M. BOYER, 114 Rue du Bac, Paris VIIe, France. 1928.
- WATSON BOYES, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1928.
- Prof. CHARLES S. BRADEN, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1926.
- AARON BRAV, M.D., 2027 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.
- *Prof. JAMES HENRY BREASTED, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1891.
- Rabbi BARNETT R. BRICKNER, 8206 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, Ohio. 1926.
- Miss EMILIE GRACE BRIGGS, Hotel Holley, 36 Washington Square West, New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Prof. GEORGE WESTON BRIGGS, M.Sc. (Drew University), Green Village Road, Madison, N. J. 1923.
- Rev. CHARLES D. BROKENSHIRE, Lock Box 56, Alma, Mich. 1917.

- Mrs. BEATRICE ALLARD BROOKS, Ph.D., Western College, Oxford, Ohio. 1919.
DAVID A. BROWN, 100 East 42nd St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
Prof. GEORGE WILLIAM BROWN, Kennedy School of Missions, 55 Elizabeth St., Hartford, Conn. 1909.
Dean OSWALD E. BROWN, Vanderbilt University School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn. 1926.
Prof. W. NORMAN BROWN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.
Prof. CARL DARLING BUCK, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1892.
Prof. FRANCIS W. BUCKLER, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1926.
Dr. LUDLOW BULL, Associate Curator, Egyptian Dept., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1917.
ALEXANDER H. BULLOCK, State Mutual Building, Worcester, Mass. 1910.
Prof. MILLAR BURROWS, Director, American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1925.
Prof. ROMAIN BUTIN, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1915.
Prof. MOSES BUTTENWIESER (Hebrew Union College), 252 Loraine Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1917.
Prof. EUGENE H. BYRNE (Columbia Univ.), 34 East 75th St., New York, N. Y. 1917.
Prof. HENRY J. CADBURY (Bryn Mawr College), 3 College Circle, Haverford, Pa. 1914.
GEORGE G. CAMERON, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1931.
Rev. JOHN CAMPBELL, Ph.D., 260 West 231st St., New York, N. Y. 1896.
Miss LILLIAN C. CANFIELD, 309 South 41st St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1931.
Prof. ALBERT J. CARNOY (Univ. of Louvain), Sparrenhof, Corbeek-Loo, Belgium. 1916.
PAUL R. CARR, 3923 Packard St., Long Island City, N. Y. 1928.
Dr. JOHN F. B. CABEUTHEERS, 1015 Prospect Boulevard, Pasadena, Calif. 1923.
HARRY W. CARTWRIGHT, c/o Dr. E. T. Engle, College of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, N. Y. 1928.
RALPH M. CHAIT, 600 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 1929.
Prof. BASIL HALL CHAMBERLAIN, c/o Lloyds Bank, Law Courts Branch, 222 Strand, London, England. 1928.
Rev. JOHN S. CHANDLER, D.D., 138 Hancock St., Auburndale, Mass. 1899.
Miss HELEN B. CHAPIN, No. 2 Shih Fang Yuan, Peiping, China. 1929.
Dr. WILLIAM J. CHAPMAN, "Fallowfield," New Boston, Mass. 1922.
Prof. JARL H. R. T. CHARPENTIER, Ph.D. (Univ. of Upsala), 12 Goethgatan, Upsala, Sweden. 1928.
Mrs. HAROLD S. CHARTIER, 40 Romeyn Ave., Amsterdam, N. Y. 1924.
Pandit J. C. CHATTERJI, India Academy of America, 200 West 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1927.

- KSHETRESHCHANDRA CHATTOPADHYAYA, M.A., Sanskrit Department, The University, Allahabad, U. P., India. 1925.
- Prof. EDWARD CHIERA, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1915.
- Dr. WILLIAM CHOMSKY, 5018 F St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- Prof. WALTER E. CLARK (Harvard University), 39 Kirkland St., Cambridge, Mass. 1906.
- Mrs. CHARLES H. CLARKE (*née* Benkard), 204 East 41st St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Rabbi ADOLPH COBLENTZ, 2029 Eutaw Place, Baltimore, Md. 1928.
- ALFRED M. COHEN, 9 West 4th St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- Rabbi HENRY COHEN, D.D., 1920 Broadway, Galveston, Texas. 1920.
- Prof. SAMUEL S. COHON, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1917.
- *Prof. HERMANN COLLITZ (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 1027 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Md. 1887.
- Dr. MAUDE GAECKLER (Mrs. H. M.) COOK, Box 175, Belton, Texas. 1915.
- Rev. GEORGE S. COOKE, 30 Green St., Northampton, Mass. 1917.
- Dr. ANANDA K. COOMARASWAMY, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1917.
- *Prof. DOUGLAS HILARY CORLEY (Univ. of Louisville), 2310 Wetstein Ave., Louisville, Ky. 1922.
- Sir J. C. COYAJEE (Presidency College), c/o Park St. Branch, Imperial Bank of India, Calcutta, India. 1928.
- Prof. JOHN WALLIS CREIGHTON (College of Wooster), 1681 Burbank Road, Wooster, Ohio. 1929.
- Rev. JOHN R. CROSBY, Ph.D., D.D., St. Luke's Church, Seaford, Del. 1927.
- Prof. EARLE B. CROSS, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y. 1927.
- Prof. DAVID E. CULLEY, D. D. (Western Theol. Seminary), 57 Belvidere St., Crafton, Pa. 1928.
- Prof. CHARLES GORDON CUMMING (Bangor Theol. Seminary), 353 Hammond St., Bangor, Maine. 1928.
- Miss CECILIA CUTTS (Univ. of Washington), 6011 31st Ave., N.E., Seattle, Wash. 1926.
- Prof. M. ELIZ. J. CZARNOMSKA, Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va. 1928.
- Prof. GEORGE H. DANTON (Oberlin College), 47 College Place, Oberlin, Ohio. 1921.
- Prof. ISRAEL DAVIDSON (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 92 Morningside Ave., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. FRANK LEIGHTON DAY, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va. 1920.
- Prof. JOHN PITT DEANE, Beloit College, Beloit, Wis. 1926.
- Dr. NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE, 1114 W. California St., Urbana, Ill. 1927.
- Dean IRWIN HOCH DELONG (Theol. Seminary of the Reformed Church), 523 West James St., Lancaster, Pa. 1916.
- Prof. ROBERT E. DENGLEB (Pennsylvania State College), 210 South Gill St., State College, Pa. 1920.
- JOHN HOPKINS DENISON, The University Club, 1 West 54th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.

- RAMA DEVA, Principal, The Gurukula, Kangri P. O., Bijnor Dist., U. P., India. 1928.
- JAMES DEVADASAN, Theological Seminary, Bareilly, India. 1929.
- HERBERT J. DEVINE, The Shelton, Lexington Ave. and 49th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- A. SANDERS DEWITT, M.D., 4854 Third Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1930.
- MRS. A. SANDERS DEWITT, 4854 Third Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1928.
- NARIMAN M. DHALLA, M.A., 15 Royal Artillery Lines, Karachi, India. 1922.
- MRS. FRANCIS W. DICKINS, Apartment 606, The Wyoming, Washington, D. C. 1911.
- DR. FREDERICK W. DICKINSON, Incarnate Word College, Broadway, San Antonio, Texas. 1929.
- Prof. ERNST DIEZ, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1928.
- PRES. BAYARD DODGE, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Syria. 1926.
- Rev. MARTIN LUTHER DOLBEER, Narasaravupet, Guntur District, South India. 1929.
- LEON DOMINIAN, American Consul General, Stuttgart, Germany. 1916.
- Rev. DWIGHT M. DONALDSON, Ph.D., D.D., Meshed, Persia. 1928.
- Prof. AGNES C. L. DONOHUGH (Hartford Seminary Foundation), 23 Midland Ave., White Plains, N. Y. 1926.
- Rev. A. T. DORF, 114 Bay Ridge Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1916.
- DR. GEORGES DOSSIN (Univ. of Liège), 20 Rue des Ecoles, Wandre-lez-Liège, Belgium. 1926.
- Prof. RAYMOND P. DOUGHERTY (Yale Univ.), 83 Mill Rock Road, New Haven, Conn. 1918.
- Chaplain C. HAROLD DOUGLAS, Th.D., Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va. 1928.
- Prof. JOHN DOW, 50 St. George St., Toronto, Canada. 1929.
- Prof. PAUL EMILE DUMONT, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1930.
- Prof. FREDERIC C. DUNCALF, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. 1919.
- Prof. GEORGE S. DUNCAN (American Univ., Y. M. C. A. School of Religion), 2900 Seventh St., N. E., Washington, D. C. 1917.
- DOWS DUNHAM, Assistant Curator, Egyptian Dept., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Mass. 1929.
- Prof. CHARLES DUBOISELLE, M.A. (Rangoon Univ.), "C" Road, Mandalay, Burma. 1922.
- Prof. FRANKLIN EDGERTON (Yale Univ.), 1973 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1910.
- Prof. WILLIAM F. EDGERTON, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
- Dean GRANVILLE D. EDWARDS (Bible College of Missouri), 811 College Ave., Columbia, Mo. 1917.
- Rev. Dr. ISRAEL EFROS, Temple Beth El, 153 Richmond Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1918.

- Rabbi LOUIS I. EGELSON, 2 Avon Apts., Reading Road and Clifton Springs Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1927.
- Pres. FREDERICK C. EISELEN, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1901.
- Dr. ISRAEL EITAN, 5712 Forbes St., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1928.
- ABRAM I. ELKUS, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Rev. Dr. BARNETT E. ELZAS, 42 West 72d St., New York, N. Y. 1923.
- Dr. MURRAY B. EMENEAU (Yale Univ.), 1910 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1929.
- Rabbi H. G. ENELOW, D.D., Temple Emanu-El, 1 East 65th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. MORTON SCOTT ENSLIN (Crozer Theol. Seminary), 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa. 1925.
- SIDNEY I. ESTERSON, 113 North Chester St., Baltimore, Md. 1926.
- Pres. MILTON G. EVANS, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. 1921.
- Mrs. EDWARD WARREN EVERETT, Swan House, Hinsdale, Ill. 1930.
- Dr. SAMUEL FEIGIN, 1424 Mellon St., E. E., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1924.
- Dr. S. FELDMAN, Dept. of Psychology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1926.
- FRANCIS JOSEPH FENDLEY, 2234 Q St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1927.
- HENRY COURTENAY FENN, 334 Ashbourne Road, Elkins Park, Pa. 1929.
- Dr. JOHN C. FERGUSON, 3 Hsi-Chiao Hutung, Peiping, China. 1900.
- Miss HELEN E. FERNALD, Assistant Curator, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1927.
- Prof. BENIGNO FERRARIO, Casilla de Correo 445, Montevideo, Uruguay. 1927.
- Rabbi MORRIS M. FEUERLICHT, 3034 Washington Boulevard, Indianapolis, Ind. 1922.
- HENRY FIELD, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Rabbi WILLIAM H. FINESHRIER, 1916 Rittenhouse Square, Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- Dr. SOLOMON B. FINESINGER, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1922.
- Rabbi JOSEPH L. FINK, 599 Delaware Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1920.
- Dr. JOSHUA FINKEL, 3505 Ave. I, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1929.
- Prof. LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, Jewish Theological Seminary, 531 West 123d St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Dean EDGAR J. FISHER, Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey. 1931.
- Prof. DANIEL J. FLEMING, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, 3041 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rev. FRED FOERSTER, Ph.D., First Lutheran Church, Jeffersonville, N. Y. 1926.
- Miss HELEN MOORE FOGG, 227 East 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1930.
- * MAYNARD DAUCHY FOLLIN, P. O. Box 118, Detroit, Mich. 1922.
- Dean HUGHELL E. W. FOSBROKE, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1917 (1907).
- Dr. FRANK H. FOSTER, 184 Forest St., Oberlin, Ohio. 1931.

- Rabbi SOLOMON FOSTER, 90 Treacy Ave., Newark, N. J. 1921.
- Rev. WILLIAM M. FOUTS, Th.D., 3040 W. Washington Boulevard, Station D, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Prof. HENRY T. FOWLER, Brown University, Providence, R. I. 1926.
- Rabbi GRESHAM GEORGE FOX, Ph.D., 7524 Essex Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1924.
- Rabbi LEON FRAM, 8801 Woodward Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1926.
- Prof. JAMES EVERETT FRAME, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway and 120th St., New York, N. Y. 1892.
- W. B. FRANKENSTEIN, 9 West Kinzie St., Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- Rabbi LEO M. FRANKLIN, M.A., 26 Edison Ave., Detroit, Mich. 1920.
- Rabbi SOLOMON B. FREEHOF, D.D., Hotel Aragon, 54th St. and Cornell Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1918.
- MAURICE J. FREIHERG, 701 First National Bank Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- Prof. ALEXANDER FREIMAN, Ph.D. (Univ. of Leningrad), Zwerinskaya 40, Leningrad, U. S. S. R. 1928.
- Rabbi HIRSCH L. FREUND, 226 N. Washington St., Sumter, S. C. 1929.
- Prof. LESLIE ELMER FULLER, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1916.
- Prof. KEMPER FULLERTON, Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, Ohio. 1916.
- ERWIN H. FURMAN, 1750 Sycamore Ave., Hollywood, Calif. 1928.
- * Prof. A. B. GAJENDRAGADKAR, Elphinstone College, Bombay, India. 1921.
- Prof. ESSON M. GALE, University of California, Berkeley, Calif. 1929.
- ALBERT GALLATIN, 7 East 67th St., New York, N. Y. 1930.
- ALEXANDER B. GALT, 2219 California St., Washington, D. C. 1917.
- CHARLES S. GARDNER, 148 Highland Ave., Newtonville, Mass. 1930.
- KANHAIYA LAL GARGIYA, The Mahalakshmi Mills Co., Ltd., Beawar, Rajputana, India. 1927.
- Pres. CALEB F. GATES, LL.D., Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey. 1929.
- Prof. FRANK GAVIN, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1917.
- Dr. F. W. GEERS, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1928.
- Dr. HENRY SNYDER GEHMAN, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1916.
- EUGENE A. GELLOT, 149-46 117th St., Aqueduct, L. I., N. Y. 1911.
- Prof. BEREND GEMSER, Litt. Dr., Theol. Dr., Transvaal University College, Pretoria, South Africa. 1928.
- GUION M. GEST, 1336 Woolworth Building, New York, N. Y. 1930.
- Rev. PHARES B. GIBBLE, 4 North College St., Palmyra, Pa. 1921.
- Rev. Dr. GEORGE W. GILMORE, The Homiletic Review, 354 Fourth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- ALBERT D. GLANVILLE, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1931.
- Rabbi NELSON GLUECK, Ph.D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1928.
- SWAMI GNANESWARANANDA, 120 E. Delaware Place, Chicago, Ill. 1930.
- Prof. ALLEN H. GODFREY, Duke University, Durham, N. C. 1928.

- Rev. CRANSTON E. GODDARD, 1234 Woods St., Sherman, Texas. 1927.
- Rabbi S. H. GOLDENSON, Ph.D., 4905 Fifth Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.
- Rabbi SOLOMON GOLDMAN, c/o Anshe Emes Congregation, 3762 Pine Grove Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1920.
- Dr. JANE F. GOODLOE, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md. 1926.
- L. CARRINGTON GOODRICH, c/o North China Union Language School, Peiping, China. 1929.
- Rev. Dr. FRED FIELD GOODSSELL, 14 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1931.
- Dr. CYRUS H. GORDON (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 6026 Carpenter St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- HIRSCH LOEB GORDON, Ph.D., D.H.L., 2161 Southern Boulevard, Bronx, New York, N. Y. 1929.
- * Prof. RICHARD J. H. GOTTHEIL, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1886.
- KINGDON GOULD, 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1914.
- Prof. HERBERT HENRY GOWEN, D.D. (Univ. of Washington), 5005 22d Ave., N. E., Seattle, Wash. 1920.
- Rev. DAVID C. GRAHAM, Ph.D., 79 Roselawn Ave., Fairport, N. Y. 1931.
- Prof. WILLIAM CREIGHTON GRAHAM, Box 2, Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- Prof. ELIHU GRANT, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1907.
- Dean FREDERICK C. GRANT (Western Theol. Seminary), 600 Haven St., Evanston, Ill. 1929.
- JACOB GRAPE, 1575 Abbottston St., Baltimore, Md. 1926.
- BENJ. F. GRAVELY, P. O. Box 209, Martinsville, Va. 1925.
- MORTIMER GRAVES, Assistant Secretary, American Council of Learned Societies, 907 Fifteenth St., Washington, D. C. 1929.
- SOLOMON GRAYZEL, Gratz College, N. Philadelphia Sta., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- Rabbi SIMON GREENBERG, 5635 Wyndale Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- ROGER S. GREENE, China Medical Board, The Rockefeller Foundation, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1926.
- *Dr. LUCIA C. G. GRIEVE, 50 Heck Ave., Ocean Grove, N. J. 1894.
- Prof. ELDON GRIFFIN (Univ. of Washington), 2012 19th Ave., N., Seattle, Wash. 1929.
- Rev. Dr. HERVEY D. GRISWOLD, 20 Rowsley St., Bridgeport, Conn. 1920.
- MICHAEL J. GRUENTHNER, St. Mary's College, St. Mary's, Kans. 1929.
- Prof. LÉON GRÉ (Université libre d'Angers), 10 Rue La Fontaine, Angers, M.-et-L., France. 1921.
- W. F. GUNAWARDHANA, Rose Villa, Mount Lavinia, Ceylon. 1928.
- Babu SHIVA PRASAD GUPTA, Seva Upavana, Hindu University, Benares, India. 1921.
- Dr. CARL E. GUTHE (Univ. of Michigan), 1047 Martin Place, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1928.
- *Dr. GEORGE C. O. HAAS, 555 Edgecombe Ave., New York, N. Y. 1903.
- Prof. WILLIAM J. HAIL, D.D., College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio. 1928.

- Dr. GEORGE ELLERY HALE, Director, Mt. Wilson Observatory, Pasadena, Calif. 1920.
- ABRAHAM S. HALKIN (Columbia Univ.), 1152 Grant Ave., New York, N. Y. 1927.
- Prof. FRANK H. HALLOCK, D.D. (Western Theol. Seminary), 600 Haven St., Evanston, Ill. 1926.
- Prof. CLARENCE H. HAMILTON, 144 Forest St., Oberlin, Ohio. 1926.
- VALDEMAR T. HAMMER, Branford, Conn. 1925.
- Dr. E. S. CRAIGHILL HANDY, Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1924.
- *Rev EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY, JR., Ph.D., General Theological Seminary, 175 Ninth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1924.
- Pres. FRANKLIN STEWART HARRIS, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. 1929.
- ZELLIG S. HARRIS, 5601 W. Diamond St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1931.
- Rev. MAX H. HARRISON, United Theological College, Bangalore, S. India. 1927.
- PAUL W. HARRISON, M.D., 25 East 22nd St., New York, N. Y. 1931.
- HENRY H. HART, J.D., 328 Post St., San Francisco, Calif. 1925.
- Prof. WILLIAM H. P. HATCH, D.D., Th.D. (Episcopal Theol. School), 6 St. John's Road, Cambridge, Mass. 1930.
- JOEL HATHEWAY, 15 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1923.
- Prof. RAYMOND S. HAUPERT, Moravian College and Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Pa. 1926.
- Prof. A. EUSTACE HAYDON, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1922.
- WYNDHAM HAYWARD, 1200 E. Robinson Ave., Orlando, Fla., 1925.
- Rev. GEORGE P. HEDLEY, Th.D. (Pacific School of Religion), 2625 Piedmont Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1931.
- Rev. Dr. JOHN HEDLEY, P. O. Box 3029, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1926.
- N. M. HEERAMANECK, 724 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1931.
- LOUIS F. HEINRICHSMEYER, 4 Concordia Place, Bronxville, N. Y. 1928.
- Rabbi JAMES G. HELLER, 3634 Reading Road, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- Rev. JAMES M. HESS, American College, Madura, S. India. 1928.
- Rabbi EUGENE E. HIBSHMAN, 3004 Union Ave., Altoona, Pa. 1929.
- ROWLAND H. C. HILL, Box 1056, Sea Cliff, N. Y. 1929.
- Prof. WILLIAM BANCROFT HILL, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. WILLIAM J. HINKE (Auburn Theol. Seminary), 156 North St., Auburn, N. Y. 1907.
- RAI BAHADUR HIRALAL, Katni Murwara, C. P., India. 1928.
- Prof. HARTWIG HIRSCHFELD, Ph.D. (Univ. of London), 195 Lauderdale Mansions, London, W. 9, England. 1928.
- Prof. PHILIP K. HITT, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1915.
- †Dean CHARLES T. HOCK, D.D. (Bloomfield Theol. Seminary), 222 Liberty St., Bloomfield, N. J. 1921 (1903).
- Prof. LEWIS HODOUS (Hartford Seminary Foundation), 92 Sherman St., Hartford, Conn. 1919.
- G. F. HOFF, 404 Union Building, San Diego, Calif. 1920.

- Rev. WILLIS E. HOGG, 122 E. North St., Geneseo, Ill. 1926.
- Prof. CLARK HOPKINS (Yale Univ.), 548 Orange St., New Haven, Conn. 1931.
- * Prof. E. WASHBURN HOPKINS (Yale Univ.), 299 Lawrence St., New Haven, Conn. 1881.
- LOUIS L. HORCH, 310 Riverside Drive, N. Y. 1928.
- Dr. WILLIAM WOODWARD HORNELL, Vice-Chancellor, Hong-Kong University, Hong-Kong, China. 1928.
- Prof. JACOB HOSCHANDER (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 207 West 110th St., New York, N. Y. 1914.
- Prof. HERBERT PIERBEPONT HOUGHTON, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn. 1925.
- Rev. QUENTIN K. Y. HUANG, American Church Mission, Nanchang, Kiangsi, China. 1927.
- Dr. EDWARD H. HUME, Director, New York Post-Graduate Medical School and Hospital, 303 East 20th St., New York, N. Y. 1909.
- Prof. ROBERT ERNEST HUME (Union Theol. Seminary), 606 West 122nd St., New York, N. Y. 1914.
- ARTHUR W. HUMMEL, Chinese Collection, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1928.
- * Dr. ARCHER M. HUNTINGTON, 3 East 89th St., New York, N. Y. 1912.
- Prof. ISAAC HUSIK, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1916.
- Prof. MARY INDA HUSSEY, Mt. Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass. 1901.
- Rev. Dr. MOSES HYAMSON (Jewish Theol. Seminary), 65 East 96th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- * JAMES HAZEN HYDE, 67 Boulevard Lannes, Paris, France. 1909.
- Prof. WALTER WOODBURN HYDE, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
- * Prof. HENRY HYVERNAT (Catholic Univ. of America), 3405 Twelfth St., N. E. (Brookland), Washington, D. C. 1889.
- Prof. MOHAMMAD IQBAL, Ph.D., Oriental College, Punjab University, Lahore, India. 1926.
- Prof. W. A. IRWIN, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1927.
- Prof. K. A. SUBBRAMANIA IYER, M.A., University of Lucknow, Lucknow, India. 1926.
- Miss NEJLA M. IZZEDDIN, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- SULEIMAN A. IZZEDDIN, P. O. Box 626, Beirut, Syria. 1927.
- * Prof. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1885.
- Mrs. A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON, care of Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1912.
- Prof. FREDERICK J. FOAKES JACKSON, D.D. (Union Theol. Seminary), Dana Place, Englewood, N. J. 1920.
- J. E. JADERQUIST, 536 S. Hope St., Los Angeles, Calif. 1928.

- Prof. R. D. JAMESON, National Tsing Hua University, Peiping, China. 1929.
- Mrs. MORRIS JASTROW, JR., 248 South 23d St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.
- DON BARON JAYATILAKA, M.A., Westerfield, Castle St., Colombo, Ceylon. 1928.
- HORACE H. F. JAYNE (Univ. of Pennsylvania Museum), Memorial Hall, Fairmount Park, Philadelphia, Pa. 1930.
- Rev. Prof. ARTHUR JEFFREY, American University, 113 Sharia Kasr el Aini, Cairo, Egypt. 1923.
- Dr. GEORGE JESHURUN, 1366 55th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1925.
- * Prof. JAMES RICHARD JEWETT, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1887.
- MUNI JINAVIJAYAJI, Principal, Gujarat Puratattva Mandir, Ellisbridge, Ahmedabad, India. 1928.
- Rev. FREDERICK WILLIAM JOHNSON, Westerhope Vicarage, Newcastle-on-Tyne, England. 1926.
- * Dr. HELEN M. JOHNSON, Osceola, Mo. 1921.
- Hon. NELSON TRUSLER JOHNSON, American Legation, Peiping, China. 1921.
- Prof. OBED S. JOHNSON (Wabash College), 410 Crawford St., Crawfordsville, Ind. 1929.
- Capt. SAMUEL JOHNSON, P. O. Box 611, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1928.
- † CHARLES JOHNSTON, 26 Washington Square, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Sir REGINALD F. JOHNSTON, 4 Eversfield Road, Richmond, Surrey, England. 1919.
- Rev. FRANKLIN JOINER, 2013 Appletree St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.
- Rev. CONRAD W. JORDAN, 101 Sefton Ave., Hamilton, Md. 1925.
- Prof. S. L. JOSHI, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. 1927.
- SUNDER JOSHI, 44 Walker St., Cambridge, Mass. 1929.
- Prof. MOSES JUNG, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. 1926.
- Dean MAXIMO M. KALAW, University of the Philippines, Manila, P. I. 1922.
- Dr. LOUIS L. KAPLAN, 489 Willoughby Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1926.
- Prof. ELMER LOUIS KAYSER (George Washington Univ.), 2100 G St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1921.
- Rev. Dr. CLARENCE E. KEISER, Lyon Station, Pa. 1913.
- CHARLES PENROSE KEITH, Litt.D., 5219 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- CARL T. KELLER, 80 Federal St., Boston, Mass. 1928.
- CHARLES FABENS KELLEY, The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1926.
- * Prof. MAX L. KELLNER, D.D., 3 Concord Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1886.
- FREDERICK W. KELLOGG, 145 East Mariposa St., Altadena, Calif. 1930.
- JOHN P. KELLOGG, Room 1236, Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Co., Chicago, Ill. 1926.
- Prof. ROBERT J. KELLOGG, 1837 Pendleton Ave., Kansas City, Mo. 1926.
- Prof. FREDERICK T. KELLY (Univ. of Wisconsin), 2019 Monroe St., Madison, Wis. 1917.

- EASTON T. KELSEY, Department of State, Washington, D. C. 1930.
 Pres. JAMES A. KELSO, Western Theological Seminary, 731 Ridge Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1915.
 Prof. JAMES L. KELSO, D.D. (Pittsburgh-Xenia Theol. Seminary), 616 W. North Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1921.
 Prof. JOHN M. KELSO, Williamsport, Pa. 1923.
 Prof. ELIZA H. KENDRICK, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1896.
 Prof. ROLAND G. KENT, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1910.
 Prof. ANDREW KEOGH (Yale Univ.), 49 Huntington St., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
 Prof. H. A. F. KERN, M.D., D.D. (Susquehanna Univ.), 311 N. Market St., Selins Grove, Pa. 1929.
 LEEDS C. KERR, Army and Navy Club, Washington, D. C. 1916.
 Dean FEDEBICK D. KERSHNER, LL.D., College of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind. 1930.
 Rev. ROBERT O. KEVIN, JR., Philadelphia Divinity School, 42d and Locust Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
 H. KEVORKIAN, 40 West 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1927.
 GANDA SINGH KEWAL, Ph.B., B.Sc., Khalsa College, Amritsar, India. 1929.
 Prof. ISADORE KEYFITZ, Lowry Hall, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 1930 (1920).
 Prof. ANIS E. KHURI, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Syria. 1921.
 Dr. GEORGE B. KING, 1050 Grosvenor Ave., Winnipeg, Man., Canada. 1927.
 Prof. GEORGE L. KITTREDGE (Harvard Univ.), 8 Hilliard St., Cambridge, Mass. 1899.
 EUGENE KLEIN, 44 North 50th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1920.
 Prof. CARL S. KNOPF, 4850 Angeles Vista Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif. 1929.
 Rev. Dr. RAYMOND C. KNOX, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1928.
 Dr. GEORGE ALEXANDER KOHUT (Jewish Inst. of Religion), 1185 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1924 (1894).
 ABRAM SETSUZOH KOTSUJI, Th.D., c/o Nippon Shinggako, 100 Tsunohazu, Yodobashi, Tokyo, Japan. 1931.
 Prof. CARL H. KRAELING (Yale Univ.), 67 Ridgewood Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1925.
 Prof. EMIL G. H. KRAELING (Union Theol. Seminary), 531 East 18th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1920.
 S. N. KRAMER, 930 Flanders Road, Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
 Rabbi NATHAN KRASS, D.D., Temple Emanu-El, 1 East 65th St., New York, N. Y. 1924.
 Pres. MELVIN G. KYLE (Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary), 616 W. North Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1909.
 Mrs. OLIVER LA FARGE, 2d (*née* Mathews), 205 East 69th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
 Miss M. ANTONIA LAMB, 212 South 46th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.

- Rev. Dr. MILTON B. LAMBDIN, 3534 Park Place, N. W., Washington, D. C. 1928.
- SAMUEL C. LAMPORT, 509 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rabbi ISAAC LANDMAN, 333 Central Park West, New York, N. Y. 1927.
- *Prof. CHARLES ROCKWELL LANMAN (Harvard Univ.), 9 Farrar St., Cambridge, Mass. 1876.
- AMBROSE LANSING, Associate Curator, Egyptian Dept., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. KENNETH S. LATOURETTE, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1917.
- Dr. BERTHOLD LAUFER, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Ill. 1900.
- Prof. JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1918.
- Dr. BIMALA C. LAW, 43 Kailas Bose St., Calcutta, India. 1926.
- SIMON LAZARUS, High and Town Sts., Columbus, Ohio. 1921.
- JOHN W. LEA, 1520 North Robinson St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1924.
- Prof. DARWIN A. LEAVITT, 641 Church St., Beloit, Wis. 1920.
- Prof. SHAO CHANG LEE, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii. 1928.
- Rabbi DAVID LEFKOWITZ, 2415 South Boulevard, Dallas, Texas. 1921.
- Rev. Dr. LÉON LEGRAIN, University of Pennsylvania Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- Prof. KURT F. LEIDECKER, India Academy of America, 200 West 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- ALBERT J. LEON, Hotel Ansonia, 73d St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1926.
- Prof. HARRY J. LEON (Univ. of Texas), 2832 Pearl St., Austin, Texas. 1928.
- Rabbi GERSON B. LEVI, Ph. D., 919 Hyde Park Boulevard, Hyde Park Station, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
- Dr. JOSEPH LEVITSKY (Gratz College), 1737 North 32nd St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- Dr. ABRAHAM J. LEVY (College of Jewish Studies), 3123 Douglas Blvd., Chicago, Ill. 1924.
- Rev. Dr. FELIX A. LEVY, 445 Melrose St., Chicago, Ill. 1917.
- * JOHN F. LEWIS, LL. D., 1914 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- Miss ETHEL J. LINDGREN, Newnham College, Cambridge, England. 1928.
- Dr. H. S. LINFIELD, American Jewish Committee, Room 1407, 171 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y. 1912.
- Prof. ENNO LITTMANN, Ph.D., D.D. (Univ. of Tübingen), 50 Waldhäuserstr., Tübingen, Germany. 1927 (1902).
- Prof. MORRIS U. LIVELY, Centenary College, Shreveport, La. 1931.
- JOHN ELLERTON LODGE, Freer Gallery of Art, Washington, D. C. 1922.
- Prof. CLAUDE M. LOTSPEICH, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1927.
- Miss FLORENCE LOWDEN, 5805 Dorchester Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- Prof. HENRY WINTERS LUCE, D.D., Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conn. 1929.

- Prof. HENRY F. LUTZ (University of California), 1147 Spruce St., Berkeley, Calif. 1916.
- Prof. ALBERT HOWE LYBYER (Univ. of Illinois), 808 S. Lincoln Ave., Urbana, Ill. 1917 (1909).
- * Prof. DAVID GORDON LYON, 12 Scott St., Cambridge, Mass. 1882.
- ALBERT MORTON LYTGOE, Curator Emeritus, Egyptian Dept., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1899.
- Rev. WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S.J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md. 1922.
- Prof. CHESTER CHARLTON MCCOWN, D.D., Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif. 1920.
- Prof. DUNCAN B. MACDONALD, Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn. 1893.
- Rev. W. C. MACDOUGALL, Ph.D., 146 Evelyn Crescent, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1927.
- Rev. DR. WILLIAM MCGARRY, S.J., Weston College, Weston, Mass. 1928.
- DR. WILLIAM MONTGOMERY MCGOVERN, 105 Harris Hall, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 1928.
- DAVID ISRAEL MACHT, M.D., The Johns Hopkins University Medical School, Monument and Washington Sts., Baltimore, Md. 1918.
- Prof. J. F. McLAUGHLIN, D.D., 58 Roxborough St., W., Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1930.
- J. ARTHUR MACLEAN (Toledo Museum of Art), 582 Lincoln Ave., Toledo, Ohio. 1922.
- Prof. O. W. McMILLEN, Canton Union Language School, Fati, Canton, China. 1928.
- Prof. HARLEY F. MACNAIR, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Rev. ALLAN A. MACRAE, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1528 Pine St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1931.
- SWAMI MADHAVANANDA, Belur Math, Howrah District, Bengal, India. 1928.
- * Prof. HERBERT W. MAGOUN, 89 Hillcrest Road, Belmont, Mass. 1887.
- Prof. WALTER ARTHUR MAIER (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 801 DeMun Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1917.
- Prof. CARROLL B. MALONE, Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colo. 1929.
- Prof. JACOB MANN, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1921.
- Rabbi LOUIS L. MANN, Ph.D., 4622 Grand Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
- Prof. CLARENCE A. MANNING (Columbia Univ.), 25 East View Ave., Pleasantville, N. Y. 1921.
- * Rev. Prof. JAMES CAMPBELL MANRY, Institute of Character Research, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa. 1921.
- BENJAMIN MARCH, Curator of Asiatic Art, The Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit, Mich. 1926.
- Prof. RALPH MARCUS (Jewish Inst. of Religion), 684 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Rabbi ELIAS MARGOLIS, Ph.D., 16 Glen Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y. 1924.

- * Prof. MAX L. MARGOLIS, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1890.
- JAMES P. MARSH, M.D., 12 Whitman Court, Troy, N. Y. 1919.
- THOMAS E. MARSTON, Etterby Farm, Cornwall, Conn. 1931.
- JOHN MARTIN, North Adams, Mass. 1917.
- Dr. NICHOLAS N. MARTINOVITCH, 450 West 152nd St., New York, N. Y. 1924.
- Prof. ALEXANDER MARX, Jewish Theological Seminary, 531 West 123d St., New York, N. Y. 1926.
- Prof. MANMOHAN LAL MATHUR, Hindu Sahha College, Amritsar, New Delhi, India. 1927.
- Prof. ISAAC G. MATTHEWS, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. 1921 (1906).
- Prof. JOSEPH BROWN MATTHEWS, 383 Bihle House, Astor Place, New York, N. Y. 1924.
- Rabbi HARRY H. MAYER, 3512 Kenwood Ave., Kansas City, Mo. 1921.
- Rev. THEODORE MAYER, 174 Schenck St., North Tonawanda, N. Y. 1929.
- Rabbi SAMUEL S. MAYERBERG, 235 Ward Parkway, Kansas City, Mo. 1930.
- Rev. Dr. JOHN A. MAYNARD, 7149 Juno St., Forest Hills, Long Island, N. Y. 1917.
- Prof. B. C. MAZUMDAR (University of Calcutta), 33/3 Lansdowne Road, Calcutta, India. 1926.
- Prof. THEOPHILE J. MEEK, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1917.
- Rev. JAMES M. MENZIES, United Church of Canada Mission, Changteho, North Honan, China. 1930.
- Prof. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Trinity College, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1912.
- Mrs. EUGENE MEYER, 1624 Crescent Place, N. W., Washington, D. C. 1916.
- Miss JULIE MICHELET, The Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- Prof. TRUMAN MICHELSON (George Washington Univ.), Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D. C. 1899.
- GEORGE C. MILES, Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey. 1931.
- MERTON L. MILLER, 4517 Lomita St., Los Angeles, Calif. 1921.
- Rev. PHILO LAOS MILLS, D.D., 2315 Lincoln Road, N. E., Washington, D. C. 1923.
- Prof. WALLACE H. MINER, 2206 Brun St., Hyde Park, Houston, Texas. 1925.
- A. MINGANA, 34 Mauldeth Rd., Withington, Manchester, England. 1928.
- Sir BHUPENDRA NATH MITRA, High Commissioner for India, India House, Aldwych, London, W. C. 2, England. 1931.
- E. N. MOHL, P. O. Box 76, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1928.
- Dr. ROBERT LUDWIG MOND, 9 Cavendish Square, London W. 1, England. 1921.
- Prof. J. A. MONTGOMERY (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 6806 Greene St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.
- LEWIS C. MOON, Box 700, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1925.
- Miss ELLEN W. MOORE, 19 East Pierce St., Coldwater, Mich. 1927.

- FRANK G. MOORE, 264 Tuxedo Ave., Elmhurst, Ill. 1927.
- †Prof. GEORGE FOOT MOORE (Harvard Univ.), 3 Divinity Ave., Cambridge, Mass. 1925 (1887).
- Prof. LAURENCE SHAW MOORE, Robert College, Istanbul, Turkey. 1930.
- Rev. HUGH A. MORAN, 221 Eddy St., Ithaca, N. Y. 1920.
- Pres. JULIAN MORGENSTERN (Hebrew Union College), 8 Burton Woods Lane, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1915.
- * EFFINGHAM B. MORRIS, LL.D., "Tyn-y-Coed," Ardmore, Pa. 1920.
- Rev. RALPH MORTENSEN, Ph.D., Lutheran Board of Publication, 23 Liang Yi St., Hankow, China. 1928.
- KHAN BAHADUR MIEZA MUHAMMAD, C.I.E., Strand Road, Ashar, Basrah, Iraq. 1928.
- Prof. JAMES MULLENBURG (Mount Holyoke College), South Hadley, Mass. 1928.
- DHAN GOPAL MUKERJI, 325 East 72nd St., New York, N. Y. 1922.
- Prof. VALENTIN K. MULLER, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1931.
- Prof. TOYOZO W. NAKARAI, College of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind. 1926.
- EDWARD I. NATHAN, American Consulate, Monterrey, Mexico. 1928.
- Prof. HAROLD H. NELSON (Univ. of Chicago), Chicago House, Luxor, Egypt. 1928.
- ALEX. A. NENNSBERG, 1909 Minor Ave., Seattle, Wash. 1925.
- Rev. Dr. WILLIAM M. NESBIT, 507 Washington St., Wilmington, Del. 1916.
- Prof. ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN (Dropsie College), 2319 North Park Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- M. T. NEWBY, 1151 College St., Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1930.
- EDWARD THEODORE NEWELL, American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1914.
- Prof. HERBERT LEE NEWMAN (Colby College), 2 West Court, Waterville, Maine. 1928.
- Rabbi LOUIS I. NEWMAN, Ph.D., c/o Congregation Rodeph Sholom, 7 West 83rd St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Mrs. GILBERT M. NICHOLS, Assonet, Mass. 1927.
- JOHN NICOLSON, 1701 Sixteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1931.
- CHARLES F. NIMS, 2404 Detroit Ave., Toledo, Ohio. 1931.
- Dr. WILLIAM FREDERICK NOTZ, 5422 39th St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1915.
- WILLIAM F. NUTT, M.D., Ph.D., 849 Garfield Ave., Mont St. Station, Chicago, Ill. 1927.
- Dr. ALOIS RICHARD NYKL, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1922.
- Prof. H. TH. OBBINK, D.D. (Univ. of Utrecht), Dillenburgstr. 29, Utrecht, Holland. 1928.
- Prof. JULIAN J. OBERMANN, Jewish Institute of Religion, 40 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1923.
- ADOLPH S. OCHS, The New York Times, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Dr. FELIX, Freiherr von OEFELE, 326 East 58th St., New York, N. Y. 1913.

- HERBERT C. OETTINGER, Eighth and Walnut Sts., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
NAOYOSHI OGAWA, Bureau of Education, Government of Formosa, Taihoku, Formosa. 1921.
Dr. CHARLES J. OGDEN, 628 West 114th St., New York, N. Y. 1906.
Dr. ELLEN S. OGDEN, "Resthaven," R. F. D., Milford, Mass. 1898.
Prof. SAMUEL G. OLIPHANT, Grove City College, Grove City, Pa. 1906.
Prof. ALBERT TENEYCK OLMSTEAD, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1909.
Dr. H. H. VON DER OSTEN, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1931.
Prof. CHARLES A. OWEN, Assiut, Egypt. 1921.
ELEANOR PARRY, M.D., 36 Central Ave., Huntington, N. Y. 1931.
Rabbi HERBERT PARZEN, Park and Clay Sts., Portland, Ore. 1929.
ANTONIO M. PATERNO, 243 Aviles, Manila, P. I. 1922.
ROBERT LEET PATTERSON, 1703 Oliver Bldg., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1920.
Pres. CHARLES T. PAUL, 63 Girard Ave., Hartford, Conn. 1921.
ANTHONY F. PAURA, 402 75th St., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1929.
Mrs. PAUL W. PAUSTIAN, Lakeside, Ohio. 1930.
Dr. JAL DASTUR CURSETJI PAVRY, 63 Pedder Road, Malabar Hill, Bombay, India. 1921.
CHARLES K. PAYNE, 1120 Kanawha St., Charleston, W. Va. 1927.
CYRUS H. PEAKE, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1930.
Rabbi WALTER G. PEISER, 1736 Olive St., Baton Rouge, La. 1928.
Dr. FREELAND F. PENNEY, 326 Indiana St., Lawrence, Kans. 1931.
Prof. ISMAR J. PERITZ, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y. 1894.
Prof. MARSHALL LIVINGSTON PERRIN, Boston University, 688 Boylston St., Boston, Mass. 1921.
* Prof. EDWARD DELAVAN PERRY, Columbia University, New York, N. Y. 1879.
Dr. ARNOLD PESKIND, 2409 East 55th St., Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.
Rev. THEODORE C. PETERSEN, C.S.P., Ph.D., Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1924.
Prof. WALTER PETERSEN, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1909.
Dr. ROBERT HENRY PFEIFFER, S.T.M. (Harvard Univ.), 82 Larch Road, Cambridge, Mass. 1920.
Prof. DRYDEN L. PHELPS, Union University, Chengtu, Szechuan Prov., W. China. 1929.
* Rev. Dr. DAVID PHILIPSON, 270 McGregor Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1889.
Hon. WILLIAM PHILLIPS, 17 Commonwealth Ave., Boston, Mass. 1917.
Rev. Dr. Z. B. T. PHILLIPS, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C. 1922.
Rev. CLAUDE L. PICKENS, JR., 43 Tungting Road, Hankow, Hupeh, China. 1931.
MAURICE B. PIEKARSKY, Jewish Institute of Religion, 40 West 68th St., New York, N. Y. 1931.
Prof. K. RAMA PISHAROTTI, Sanskrit College, Trippunithura, Cochin State, S. India. 1929.

- Rev. MALCOLM S. PITT, 99 Claremont Ave., New York, N. Y. 1925.
- Prof. ARNO POEBEL, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- HORACE I. POLEMAN, 402 Green Lane, Roxborough, Philadelphia, Pa. 1931.
- PAUL POPENOE, 2495 N. Marengo Ave., Altadena, Calif. 1914.
- Rev. Dr. JOSEPH POPLICH, 113 Catawissa St., Mahanoy City, Pa. 1927.
- Prof. WILLIAM POPPER (University of California), 529 The Alameda, Berkeley, Calif. 1897.
- Prof. LUCTUS C. PORTER, Yenching University, Peiping, China. 1923.
- Prof. D. V. POTDAR (New Poona College), 180 Shanvar Peth, Poona, India. 1921.
- RANDLE H. POWLEY, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1930.
- Prof. JAMES BISSETT PRATT, Williams College, Williamstown, Mass. 1925.
- Rev. Dr. SABELL PRENTICE, 17 East 11th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- * Prof. IRA M. PRICE, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1887.
- * Hon. JOHN DYNELEY PRINCE (Columbia Univ.), American Legation, Belgrade, Yugoslavia. 1888.
- FRANK H. PRITCHARD, M.D., Colton, Calif. 1929.
- ARTHUR PROBSTHAIN, 41 Great Russell St., London W. C. 1, England. 1928.
- Rev. Dr. A. H. PRUESSNER, c/o Methodist Mission, Medan, Sumatra. 1921.
- MORRIS H. PULLIN, College of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind. 1929.
- Prof. CHARLES LYNN PYATT, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky. 1921 (1917).
- Prof. GEORGE PAYN QUACKENBOS, Colonial Heights, Tuckahoe, N. Y. 1904.
- Prof. HAROLD S. QUIGLEY, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. 1928.
- HEMENDRA K. RAKHIT, 500 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1926.
- G. RAMADAS, Sri Ramachandra Vilas, Jeypore, Vizagapatam, S. India. 1928.
- Dr. V. V. RAMANA-SASTRIN, Vedaraniyam, Tanjore District, S. India. 1921.
- WILLIAM MADISON RANDALL, M.A., University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1926.
- Prof. JOHN H. RAVEN (New Brunswick Theol. Seminary), Bishop Place, New Brunswick, N. J. 1920.
- Pres. CASS ARTHUR REED, International College, Izmir, Turkey. 1929.
- Prof. HARRY B. REED (Northwestern Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 960 19th Ave., N. E., Minneapolis, Minn. 1921.
- Rabbi SIDNEY L. REGNER, 40 North 11th St., Reading, Pa. 1928.
- Prof. NATHANIEL JULIUS REICH (Dropsie College), P. O. Box 337, Philadelphia, Pa. 1923.
- Rabbi VICTOR E. REICHERT, Litt.D., Rockdale Avenue Temple, Cincinnati, Ohio. 1927.
- Dr. JOSEPH REIDER, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa. 1913.
- Prof. AUGUST KARL REISCHAUER, Tokyo Joshi Daigaku, Iogimachi, Tokyo-fu, Japan. 1920.
- Rev. HILARY G. RICHARDSON, 147 North Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y. 1926.

- Prof. FRANK H. RIDGLEY, Lincoln University, Pa. 1929.
AMEEN RIHANI, c/o Joseph Sader, Imprimerie Scientifique, Beirut, Syria.
1930.
- Prof. EDWARD ROBERTSON, University College of North Wales, Bangor,
Wales. 1921.
- Rev. Dr. CHARLES WELLINGTON ROBINSON, Christ Church, Bronxville, N. Y.
1916.
- Prof. DAVID M. ROBINSON, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
1921.
- Prof. GEORGE LIVINGSTON ROBINSON (Presbyterian Theol. Seminary), 2312
North Halsted St., Chicago, Ill. 1892.
- Rev. Dr. THEODORE H. ROBINSON, University College, Cardiff, Wales. 1922.
GEORGE N. ROERICH, Roerich Museum, 310 Riverside Drive, New York,
N. Y. 1922.
- Prof. NICHOLAS ROERICH, Roerich Museum, 310 Riverside Drive, New York,
N. Y. 1928.
- Mrs. ROSS W. ROGERS (*née* Henkel), 508 Park Ave., Mansfield, Ohio. 1928.
- Dr. PINCHAS ROMANOFF, 1919 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1930.
- Prof. JAMES HARDY ROPES (Harvard Univ.), 13 Follen St., Cambridge,
Mass. 1893.
- HAROLD ROSEN, 5802 North 12th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1931.
- Prof. WILLIAM ROSENAU, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.
1897.
- Dr. SAMUEL ROSENBLATT (Johns Hopkins Univ.), 3507 Springdale Ave.,
Baltimore, Md. 1929.
- * JULIUS ROSENWALD, Ravinia, Ill. 1920.
- LESSING J. ROSENWALD, care of Sears, Roebuck and Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
1924.
- Prof. MICHAEL I. ROSTOVITZEFF (Yale Univ.), 1916 Yale Station, New
Haven, Conn. 1926.
- SAMUEL ROTHENBERG, M.D., 22 West 7th St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1921.
- AMIN ROUSTEM, Egyptian Consulate, 103 Park Ave., New York, N. Y.
1928.
- Miss TERESINA ROWELL, 204 S. Garfield St., Hinsdale, Ill. 1931.
- Prof. GEORGE ROWLEY, McCormick Hall, Princeton University, Princeton,
N. J. 1926.
- Miss ADELAIDE RUDOLPH, Columbia University Library, New York, N. Y.
1894.
- OTTO B. RUPP, LL.D., 660 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. 1931.
- Dean CHARLES L. RUSSELL (S. G. Miller School of Theology), 217 Eye St.,
N. W., Washington, D. C. 1930.
- Prof. ELBERT RUSSELL, Duke University, Durham, N. C. 1916.
- Dr. NAJEEB M. SALEEBY, P. O. Box 226, Manila, P. I. 1922.
- Rev. FRANK K. SANDERS, Ph.D., Marmion Way, Rockport, Mass. 1897.
- Prof. HENRY A. SANDERS, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1924.
- Prof. GUY W. SARVIS, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn. 1930.
- Mrs. A. H. SAUNDERS, 552 Riverside Drive, New York, N. Y. 1915.


- Prof. KENNETH J. SAUNDERS (Pacific School of Religion), High Acres, Creston Road, Berkeley, Calif. 1924.
- Prof. HENRY SCHAEFER (Lutheran Theol. Seminary), 1606 South 11th Ave., Maywood, Chicago, Ill. 1916.
- Rev. G. L. SCHANZLIN, 804 Belgian Ave., Baltimore, Md. 1930 (1921).
- Dr. ISRAEL SCHAPIRO, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C. 1914.
- Rev. Richard A. SCHERMERHORN, 2128 Maple Ave., Evanston, Ill. 1930.
- Prof. A. ARTHUR SCHILLER, Columbia University Law School, New York, N. Y. 1927.
- JOHN F. SCHLICHTING, 36 Grenfell Ave., Kew Gardens, N. Y. 1920.
- MALCOLM B. SCHLOSS, 114 East 57th St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Dr. ERICH F. SCHMIDT, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1930.
- Prof. NATHANIEL SCHMIDT, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1894.
- ADOLPH SCHOENFELD, 69 East 108th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- WILFRED H. SCHOFF, The Commercial Museum, Philadelphia, Pa. 1912.
- Rev. Dr. SAMUEL SCHULMAN, 1 East 65th St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- FREDERIC D. SCHULTHEIS, 3238 West 59th St., Seattle, Wash. 1930.
- Rabbi JOSEPH J. SCHWARTZ, c/o American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine. 1925.
- JULIUS SCHWARZ, 225 West 86th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Prof. GILBERT CAMPBELL SCOGGIN, 11 Everett St., Cambridge, Mass. 1906.
- C. RANDOLPH JEFFERSON SCOTT, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.
- * Mrs. SAMUEL BRYAN SCOTT (*née* Morris), 1 Norman Lane, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903.
- Rev. KEITH C. SEELE, Chicago House, Luxor, Egypt. 1926.
- SAMUEL M. SEGAL, 4750 North 7th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- Dr. MOSES SEIDEL, 22 North Broadway, Baltimore, Md. 1917.
- Rev. Dr. WILLIAM G. SELPLE, 3000 Reisterstown Road, Baltimore, Md. 1902.
- Prof. O. R. SELLERS (Presbyterian Theol. Seminary), 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill. 1917.
- Prof. W. T. SEMPLE (Univ. of Cincinnati), 315 Pike St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1928.
- Miss MADELEINE IRÈNE SÉVERAC, 136 West 4th St., New York, N. Y. 1931.
- Dr. VICTOR N. SHARENKOFF, 241 Princeton Ave., Jersey City, N. J. 1922.
- Prof. SRI RAM SHARMA, Dayanand Anglo-Vedic College, Lahore, India. 1926.
- Prof. BHAGABAT KUMAR GOSWAMI SHASTRI, Ph.D. (Gourgopinath Temple), 28 Bonomali Sircar St., Kumartuli, Calcutta, India. 1926.
- G. HOWLAND SHAW, American Embassy, Paris, France. 1921.
- *Prof. T. LESLIE SHEAR, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. 1923.
- Prof. WILLIAM G. SHELLABEAR, 185 Girard Ave., Hartford, Conn. 1919.
- Prof. CHARLES N. SHEPARD (General Theol. Seminary), 9 Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1907.
- ANDREW R. SHERRIFF, 1320 N. State St., Chicago, Ill. 1921.
- Miss LOUISE ADELE SHIER, 1320 Olivia Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1930.

- Dr. JOHN KNIGHT SHRYOCK (Univ. of Pennsylvania), 4509 Regent St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1922.
- DON CAMERON SHUMAKER, Y. M. C. A., University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa. 1922.
- Prof. S. MOHAMMAD SIBTAIN, Government College, Ludhiana, Punjab, India. 1926.
- Rev. ARTHUR R. SIEBENS, Bowling Green, Ohio. 1926.
- Dr. JULIUS L. SIEGEL (Oriental Inst., Univ. of Chicago), 1533 S. St. Louis Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1925.
- Rev. REINHARD P. SIEVING, 801 DeMun Ave., St. Louis, Mo. 1927.
- Rabbi ABBA HILLEL SILVER, D. D., The Temple, East 105th St. at Ansel Road, Cleveland, Ohio. 1920.
- Dr. SOLOMON L. SKOSS, Dropsie College, Broad and York Sts., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- Prof. S. B. SLACK, 17 Barton Crescent, Dawlish, Devon, England. 1921.
- *JOHN R. SLATTERY, 47 Avenue de l'Opéra, Paris, France. 1903.
- Miss WINIFRED SMEATON, 1941 Geddes Ave., Ann Arbor, Mich. 1931.
- C. H. SMILEY, 5827 Maryland Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Rev. H. FRAMER SMITH, 153 Institute Place, Chicago, Ill. 1922.
- Prof. J. M. POWIS SMITH, University of Chicago, Chicago Ill. 1906.
- Prof. LOUISE P. SMITH, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. 1918.
- Dr. MARIA WILKINS SMITH (Temple Univ.), 3800 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- MYRON BEMENT SMITH, 400 East 52nd St., New York, N. Y. 1930.
- Rabbi ELIAS L. SOLOMON, D.H.L., 302 West 87th St., New York, N.Y. 1921.
- Prof. E. A. SPEISER, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 1925.
- Rabbi LEON SPITZ, 830 Hudson St., Hoboken, N. J. 1925.
- Rev. H. HENRY SPOER, Ph.D., 135 West 183rd St., New York, N. Y. 1926 (1899).
- Prof. MARTIN SPRENGLING, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1929 (1912).
- JOHN FRANKLIN SPRINGER, 618 West 136th St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Baron Dr. ALEXANDER VON STAËL-HOLSTEIN, Former Austrian Legation, Peiping, China. 1929.
- Dr. W. E. STAPLES, Victoria University, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1927.
- Prof. G. NYE STEIGER, 10 Avon St., Cambridge, Mass. 1930.
- Prof. FERRIS J. STEPHENS, Babylonian Collection, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1925.
- Rabbi HARRY J. STERN, 4128 Sherbrooke St. West, Westmount, Montreal, Canada. 1928.
- HORACE STERN, 1524 North 16th St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1921.
- ISRAEL STIEFEL, 1416 S. Penn Square, Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- J. FRANK STIMSON (Bernice P. Bishop Museum), Papeete, Tahiti, French Oceania. 1928.
- WILLIAM B. STIMSON, 1920 Panama St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1928.
- Rev. Dr. ANSON PHELPS STOKES, 2408 Massachusetts Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1900.

- Prof. FREDERICK AMES STUFF (Univ. of Nebraska), Station A 1263, Lincoln, Neb. 1921.
- Prof. EDGAR HOWARD STURTEVANT (Yale Univ.), 1849 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 1924.
- Dr. W. F. STUTTERHEIM, Oudegracht 116 bis, Utrecht, Holland. 1929.
- Dr. VISHNU S. SUKTHANKAR, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, P. O. Deccan Gymkhana, Poona City, India. 1921.
- Prof. LEO SUPPAN (St. Louis College of Pharmacy), 3540 Pestalozzi St., St. Louis, Mo. 1920.
- Pres. GEORGE SVERDRUP, Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn. 1907.
- Prof. MARY HAMILTON SWINDLER, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1929.
- SEYED AHMAD KASRAWI TABRIZI, Teheran, Persia. 1929.
- Prof. ROLLIN H. TANNER, New York University, University Heights, New York, N. Y. 1929.
- Rev. CHARLES LINCOLN TAYLOR, JR., 6 Phillips Place, Cambridge, Mass. 1926.
- Prof. WILLIAM R. TAYLOR, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ont., Canada. 1925.
- Dr. CHAIM TCHERNOWITZ (Jewish Inst. of Religion), 640 West 139th St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- Rabbi SIDNEY S. TEDESCHE, Ph.D., Union Temple, 17 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1925 (1916).
- Rev. PATRICK J. TEMPLE, S.T.D., 7 State St., New York, N. Y. 1928.
- NAINSINH THAKAR, 5719 Eighteenth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y. 1923.
- Rev. Dr. GRIFFITHS W. THATCHER, Camden College, Hereford St., Glebe, N. S. W., Australia. 1926.
- EBEN FRANCIS THOMPSON, 311 Main St., Worcester, Mass. 1906.
- Rev. Dr. WILLIAM GORDON THOMPSON, Sprain Ridge, Yonkers, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Dr. WILLIAM THOMSON (Harvard Univ.), 32 Linnaean St., Cambridge, Mass. 1925.
- Prof. MONTGOMERY H. THROOP, St. John's University, Shanghai, China. 1928.
- * Prof. CHARLES C. TORREY, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1891.
- I. NEWTON TRAGER, 209 East 6th St., Cincinnati, Ohio. 1920.
- Prof. HAROLD H. TRYON, Union Theological Seminary, 3041 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Prof. RUDOLF TSCHUDI, Ph.D., Benkenstrasse 61, Basle, Switzerland. 1923.
- JOSEPH A. V. TUBCK, 522 Linden Ave., Wilmette, Ill. 1926.
- EDWIN H. TUTTLE, The Gelhave, 405 10th St., N. E., Washington, D. C. 1925.
- * Rev. Dr. LEMON LEANDER UHL, The Canterbury, 14 Charlesgate West, Boston, Mass. 1921.
- Rabbi SIDNEY E. UNGER, 615 N. Broad St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1929.
- JOSEPH M. UPTON, Assistant Curator, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1931.

- Rev. SYDNEY N. USSHER, Chapel of the Good Shepherd, City Home, Welfare Island, New York, N. Y. 1909.
- Dr. N. D. VAN LEEUWEN, Holysloot 43, Amsterdam-Noord, Holland. 1928.
- Rev. MAURICIO VANOVERBERGH, Kabugaw-Apayaw, Mountain Province, P. I. 1921.
- Prof. ARTHUR A. VASCHALDE, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1915.
- LUDWIG VOGELSTEIN, 61 Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1920.
- Prof. EDWIN E. VOIGT, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. 1925.
- Prof. HANS N. VONKOEBER, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif. 1931.
- Dr. J. D. L. DE VRIES, 11 Jac. Catsstraat, Utrecht, Holland. 1927.
- Dean LEE VROOMAN, International College, Izmir, Turkey. 1929.
- * Mrs. SOPHIE CAMACHO WADIA, c/o The Aryan Path, 51 Esplanade Road, Bombay, India. 1927.
- * FELIX M. WARBURG, 52 William St., New York, N. Y. 1921.
- Mrs. EDITH WILLIAMS WARE, Ph.D., Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1928.
- JAMES R. WARE, Harvard-Yenching Institute, Boylston Hall, Cambridge, Mass. 1923.
- Prof. O. W. WARMINGHAM (Boston Univ.), 107 University Road, Brookline, Mass. 1928.
- Prof. LEROY WATERMAN, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich. 1912.
- Dr. MEYER WAXMAN, 3225 Douglas Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Dean THOMAS WEARING (Colgate-Rochester Divinity School), 263 Canterbury Road, Rochester, N. Y. 1927.
- *Prof. HUTTON WEBSTER (Pittsburgh-Xenia Theol. Seminary), 616 W. North Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 1921.
- Dr. BARUCH WEITZEL, 4130 Leidy Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- HENRY S. WELLCOME, Director, Wellcome Historical Medical Museum, 54A Wigmore St., London W. 1, England. 1928.
- Prof. GORDON B. WELLMAN (Wellesley College), 17 Midland Road, Wellesley, Mass. 1928.
- ARCHIBALD GIBSON WENLEY, 364 Karasu-maru-dori, Demizu Agar, Kyoto, Japan. 1925.
- Rev. O. V. WERNER, c/o R. C. Werner, 1507 Metropolitan Ave., Ridgewood, L. I., N. Y. 1921.
- Rev. Prof. OSCAR J. P. WETKLO (Friends Univ.), 3750 E. Douglas St., Wichita, Kans. 1930.
- Pres. GEORGE E. WHITE, D.D., Anatolia College, Salonica, Greece. 1931.
- Miss VIOLA M. WHITE, Clarkstown Country Club, Nyack, N. Y. 1928.
- *Miss MARGARET DWIGHT WHITNEY, 186 Edwards St., New Haven, Conn. 1908.
- WILLIAM B. WHITNEY, J.D., 1 West 54th St., New York, N. Y. 1929.
- PERCIVAL W. WHITTLESEY, M.A., Highmount Ave., Nyack, N. Y. 1926.
- *Miss CAROLYN M. WICKER, care of Riersen Library Art Institute, Chicago, Ill. 1921.

- Prof. ALBAN G. WIDGERY, Box 4738, Duke University, Durham, N. C. 1929.
- PETER WIERNIK, 922 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1920.
- MOSHE WILBUSHEWICH, Haifa, Palestine. 1928.
- HERMAN WILE, 566 Richmond Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. 1920.
- Rev. A. L. WILEY, Ph.D., 601 E. University St., Wooster, Ohio. 1926.
- Pres. ERNEST HATCH WILKINS, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. 1928.
- Miss RUTH C. WILKINS, 4436 Berkeley Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1931.
- HIRAM PARKES WILKINSON, M.A., Drumballyhagan, Tobermore, Co. Derry, N. Ireland. 1928.
- Prof. HERBERT L. WILLETT (Univ. of Chicago), 319 Richmond Road, Kenilworth, Ill. 1917.
- Mrs. CAROLINE RANSOM WILLIAMS, Ph.D. (Univ. of Michigan), The Chesbrough Dwellings, Toledo, Ohio. 1912.
- *Hon. EDWARD T. WILLIAMS, 1412 Scenic Ave., Berkeley, Calif. 1901.
- Mrs. FREDERICK WELLS WILLIAMS, 155 Whitney Ave., New Haven, Conn. 1918.
- GRANT WILLIAMS, The Chesbrough Dwellings, Toledo, Ohio. 1931.
- JOHN A. WILSON, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1924.
- HERBERT E. WINLOCK, Curator, Egyptian Dept., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N. Y. 1919.
- Rev. Dr. STEPHEN S. WISE, 23 West 90th St., New York, N. Y. 1894.
- Prof. JOHN E. WISHART, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif. 1911.
- Rev. ADOLF LOUIS WISMAR, Ph.D., 419 West 145th St., New York, N. Y. 1922.
- Dr. UNRAI WOGIHARA, 595 Ta-ma-mura, Kita-ta-ma-gun, Tokyo-fu, Japan. 1921.
- Prof. LOUIS B. WOLFENSON, 164 Summit Ave., Providence, R. I. 1904.
- Prof. HARRY A. WOLFSON (Harvard Univ.), 35 Divinity Hall, Cambridge, Mass. 1917.
- Rabbi LOUIS WOLSEY, 1400 Jefferson St., Philadelphia, Pa. 1926.
- FRANK ELMER WOOD, 5744 Kenwood Ave., Hyde Park, Chicago, Ill. 1929.
- Prof. FREDERICK T. WOOD, Box 1162, University, Va. 1927.
- HOWLAND WOOD, Curator, American Numismatic Society, 156th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1919.
- *Prof. IRVING F. WOOD, 1401 Fairmont St., N. W., Washington, D. C. 1905.
- Prof. WILLIAM H. WOOD (Dartmouth College), 3 Clement Road, Hanover, N. H. 1917.
- Dr. ANGUS S. WOODBURN, Babbington Garden Road, Madras, India. 1926.
- Prof. JAMES H. WOODS (Harvard Univ.), 29 Follen St., Cambridge, Mass. 1900.
- Prof. ALFRED COOPER WOOLNER, M.A. (University of the Punjab), 53 Lawrence Road, Lahore, India. 1921.
- E. C. WORMAN, 5 Russell St., Calcutta, India. 1926.



1000

82
N. ✓

Central Archaeological Library,

NEW DELHI. 24562

Call No. 891.05/JAOS:

Author—

W. H. D. American oriental